

To be sanitary engineer directors

William A. McQuary	Charles R. Bowman
James D. Williams	Earl H. Arnold
Aleck Alexander	Keith S. Krause
Clyde F. Fehn	Lloyd W. Gebhard
Frederick S. Kent	

To be pharmacist directors

Henry L. Verhulst
Reede M. Ames

To be senior pharmacists

Cornelius B. Kelly, Jr.	Frank E. Dondero
Milton W. Skolaut	Allen J. Brands

To be scientist directors

Frederick F. Ferguson	Robert J. Fitzgerald
Raymond L. Laird	Paul P. Weinstein
Floyd O. Atchley	William B. Cherry
Bernard Brookman	Harvey I. Scudder
Fay M. Hemphill	Joseph H. Schubert
Walter L. Newton	Charles R. Joyce
Geoffrey M. Jeffery	Morris Goldman
R. Edward Bellamy	Richard B. Eads

To be senior scientist

Joseph B. Margolin

To be sanitarian directors

Richard F. Clapp	Louis J. Ogden
Darold W. Taylor	Kent S. Littig

To be senior sanitarians

Clarence E. Calbert	George A. Amundson
Harold E. Thompson, Jr.	Charles E. Gerhardt
	Samuel M. Rogers

To be nurse directors

Josephine I. O'Connor	Jeannette E. Potter
Emily M. Smith	Jane Wilcox
M. Estelle Hunt	Josephine K. Fitzpatrick
Esther Kaufman	
Apollonia O. Adams	Maria B. Rementeria
Ann F. Matthews	

To be senior nurse officers

Helen Grosskopf	Anastasia M. Zahler
Walborg S. Wayne	Florence J. Ullman
Jean W. Gray	Mary F. Luvisi
Agnes V. Herrington	Elsie K. Y. Ho
Gladys M. Ray	Dorine J. Loso
Elizabeth G. Sullivan	Elizabeth Kuhlman
Agnes H. Des Marais	Faye G. Abdellah
Marie D. Grant	Elizabeth J. Haglund
Elinor D. Stanford	

To be dietitian director

Engla J. Anderson

To be senior dietitians

Margaret V. Vance	Susanne C. Van
Dorothy M. Youland	Leuzen
Jeanne L. Tillotson	

To be therapist director

Eleanor G. Loomis

To be senior therapists

Martha D. Collins
Edith W. Palmer

To be senior health services officers

William H. Redkey	Evelyn Walker
Margaret E. Heap	Heber J. R. Stevenson
Stanley I. Hirsch	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*

O Thou blessed and eternal God, inspire us daily with new vistas of outlook and new ventures of faith.

Give us a clear vision of our high vocation as coworkers with Thee in build-

ing the social order in the principles of righteousness and justice.

Show us how we may safeguard and develop the material resources and interests of our beloved country but above all may we seek to protect and promote its moral and spiritual values.

May we be sensitive and responsive to the many needs of suffering and struggling humanity and be eager to have them enjoy the blessings of the kingdom of God.

In the name of our blessed Lord we offer our prayers of praise and petition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 521. An act to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children;

S. 522. An act to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers;

S. 525. An act to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; and

S. 526. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the inclusion in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances, it is my intention, after much reflection, and in the interest of economy, fairness, and commonsense, and in the hope that this action will direct attention to the desirability of adopting rules regulating the insertion and extension of extraneous material, both in the body and in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, to object to unanimous-consent requests for the extension of remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD when such requests exceed more than one such request on any single legislative day.

By way of explanation I would like to point out that up to today the cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the 5 months period the 88th has been in session has exceeded more than \$1¼ million.

On one single day, Tuesday of last week, the cost exceeded \$27,000. While I am not objecting to the expenditure of funds for any essential service in Congress, I would point out that a large portion of this cost has been occasioned by the printing of speeches, many times including extraneous and in some cases irrelevant matter, and by the extension of remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD by Members who are not even interested sufficiently to appear on the floor of the House, and therefore, have such requests made by a second and even a third party. In such cases the RECORD ceases to be an account of the proceedings or debates in this House. Over the past few years the Appendix has ceased to conform to its original purpose, and has become instead a "catchall" for what I have previously described as "trash, tripe, and trivia," the publication of which cannot be justified by any reasonable standards.

I have long felt, and on occasions have introduced legislation which would have placed reasonable limitations on the use of the Appendix of the daily RECORD, as well as the body of the RECORD, which I believe would save many hundreds of thousands of dollars and possibly millions of dollars each year.

Other Members have also recognized the abuses, but unfortunately, no steps have been taken to correct the abuses which continue to mount. That is why I am proposing today to object to the extension of remarks by any Member who does not confine his unanimous-consent request to one instance on any legislative day, and to object to any such request when it is made by one Member on behalf of another Member who is not interested enough to appear on the floor of the House to make such request in person.

I would also propose to object to the inclusion of extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD when it is in the form of newspaper or periodical articles, editorials or other printed material, other than short excerpts from the same. This objection would also apply to testimony given before committees, speeches made by persons other than Members of Congress; tabulations taken from other Government publications or committee reports which are readily available to anyone who is interested.

Mr. Speaker, I think by this objection there will be reflected, for at least a few days, the saving that can be made if we adopted realistic rules.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] may revise and extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 73]

Abernethy	Gray	Pillion
Ayres	Gubser	Powell
Baring	Halpern	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Harris	Roybal
Brook	Hawkins	St Germain
Broomfield	Healey	Schadeberg
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Holfield	Senner
Buckley	Horton	Shelley
Cameron	Kastenmeier	Sheppard
Chelf	Kilburn	Springer
Clausen	McDade	Thompson, La.
Cohelan	Martin, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Trimble
Dawson	Mathias	Whitten
Diggs	Michel	Williams
Dorn	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Forrester	Nelsen	Willson,
Frelinghuysen	Ostertag	Charles H.
Goodell	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COAST GUARD CONFIRMS SOVIET TRAWLERS VIOLATED U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS OFF FLORIDA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard advised me late yesterday afternoon that two Soviet trawlers had violated U.S. territorial waters near the southeast Florida coast. According to the Coast Guard, one violation occurred Saturday, one occurred yesterday. The violation which occurred yesterday put the trawler at 2.2 miles off Port Everglades, Fla., and passing through an area of the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Laboratory at the port.

In each case the trawlers were kept under close surveillance as they moved down the coast toward Cuba.

Although I have reported similar violations to the proper authorities in Washington on several previous occasions, this marks the first time such violations have been officially confirmed.

What has been done about them? A check with the Departments of Defense and State this morning gave the answer—nothing.

This is a ridiculous set of conditions for this Government to operate under. A violation of U.S. airspace would be met with blistering protest. These violations are of the same order, and should be met with appropriate action.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire as to the length of the extraneous material that is to be included with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a relatively short article from the Geneva correspondent of the New York Times on trade matters. I would judge it does not consume more than a column.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would call the gentleman's attention to the statement I made a minute ago on the floor of the House. I will object to that matter appearing in the body of the RECORD, but I will not object to its appearing in the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, June 13, 1963, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein the remarks of Hon. Edward R. Murrow at East Carolina College yesterday.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to remind the gentleman again that I am objecting to the inclusion of remarks in the body of the RECORD which should appear in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, where they are readily available to the public. I shall object to including them in the body. I will not object to including them in the Appendix.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina to insert his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, June 13, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and all other special orders heretofore entered.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my very good friend from Missouri, and he is my very good friend, would give me his reason for objecting to my request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous matter. The gentleman would not object to my extending my remarks in one instance, but does object to my extending my remarks in more than one instance. What in the reason?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman had heard my remarks made at the opening of the House today he would understand that I am trying to bring some reasonableness into the use of the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I think the gentleman can accomplish his purpose by asking for one extension. I think if he will read my remarks he will agree with what I am trying to do. I am trying to save a million dollars a year. I think we can do that without unduly harming any Member of this House or restricting him in any reasonable requests he may make.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting for the gentleman to know that I have not inserted any remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD for the

past several weeks. I cannot see any reason why the gentleman should not withdraw his objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I announced earlier today that I was going to follow this policy until we can reach some agreement on a reasonable procedure.

NATIONAL REFERENDUM ON A NATIONAL LOTTERY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Public Opinion, better known as the Gallup poll, recently conducted a nationwide poll on the question of State-run lotteries. The results of this survey show that 51 percent of our adult population favors a State-run lottery to help pay the cost of government.

This nationwide poll further shows that while 10 percent of the people interviewed offered no opinion, only 39 percent opposed lotteries run by their State. Another interesting part of the survey shows that Protestants are almost evenly divided—43 percent for a State-run lottery and 46 percent opposed to this type of proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if the American taxpayers were given an opportunity to vote on the question of a national lottery as a means of cutting taxes, the percentage would be much higher in support of a Federal lottery.

In view of the reluctance and the unfounded fear among Members of Congress that a national lottery bill is a hot potato, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to report out my bill, H.R. 4026, which provides for a national referendum on this question. We did it recently for the farmers on the wheat issue; why not for all voters on the lottery question?

I am also certain that, given the chance, a vast majority of the American taxpayers will express full support and approval to a Government-run lottery. Overwhelming support of this proposition will represent a clearcut mandate to the Congress for favorable enactment of a national lottery.

Let us give the American voters a chance to voice their opinion on the question of how to raise additional revenue. Let them decide whether this type of painless and voluntary taxation is not a more palatable substitute for the burdensome taxes they now shoulder. Are we afraid of the results?

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House may once again consider Philippine war damage claims.

This issue has disrupted the normal friendly relations existing between the Government of the Philippines and the Government of the United States—a disruption caused by selfish interests trying to exploit deep feelings of love and respect held by Filipinos and Americans for each other.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues, who apparently were interested in certain news reports prior to the former passage of the bill to read the following five articles that recently appeared in the press.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair state the question.

The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks, and what?

Mr. BARRY. And include five editorials that have appeared in the newspapers with respect to the Philippine war damage claims bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to that appearing in the Appendix of the daily Record. I do object to its appearing in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Objection to the latter request is heard.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the five editorials appear in the Appendix of the daily Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF HUNGARY TO UNITED NATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 I called attention to a telegram sent to me by Mr. Christopher Emmet, one of the officers of the Captive Nations Organization, warning me and Members of the House that the government of Mr. Kadar, of Hungary, was shortly to be admitted to the United Nations with full rights of membership.

At the time I told several of my colleagues in the House that I intended to watch this and follow through on the proceedings. They were a little doubtful. It was their right. They thought probably it was not true, that it was an erroneous report.

I should like to tell the House that last week this became an accomplished fact, and that the delegation of the United States abstained from voting. It would seem almost better to support the Hungarian regime than merely to abstain in a weak-kneed manner and allow them to come into the U.N. This is the same government that slaughtered freedom-loving Hungarians not long ago. This is the same government that has held

Cardinal Mindszenty captive in our legation.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has been very unfortunate, and that our stand in the matter is deplorable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in one instance and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking loud enough to be heard. The Chair did not state the request of the gentleman from Iowa. I think there is a deliberate move to try to avoid objection. I reserve the right to object to this request until it is stated in terms that can be understood.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in one instance and include extraneous matter about legislation which we are going to take up on the floor of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, you know when these new problems of procedure come up, it is often wise for ordinary Members of the House to inquire among friends just what the rules are. The rules seem to have been changed on the insertion of extraneous material either in the body of the Record or in the Appendix of the daily Record.

I would like to inquire of my good friend who has been making some few objections just what the rules are. For example, when our mutual good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GAVIN, requested unanimous consent to place his remarks including four inserts into the Appendix of the daily Record and to include extraneous material from newspapers, the objection was made. Then the gentleman from New York, Congressman BARRY, likewise a Republican and likewise a good friend of all of us, asked unanimous consent to put his remarks in the body of the Record including extraneous material in four instances. Objection was

going to be made, that this could not be done under these new rules, but if the remarks including the four inserts were put into the Appendix of the daily RECORD there would be no objection. Therefore, under such rules we have the Gavin request ruled one way and the Barry request the other—both good friends and both Republicans, so there was no partisan consideration. How does this result occur? I would appreciate hearing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there has been no change whatever in the rules of the House. When unanimous-consent requests are made, objections may be made by any Member of the House and, of course, that is no change in the rules of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I really was not questioning the majority leader on the change of the written House rules because I know, as you do, there are none since the rules of this Congress were adopted and we have every respect for your leadership. But on the other hand, when we have the fine, self-appointed angels who are making rules by practice from the well of the House, I think we ought to inquire.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD, IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD AND TO INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATTER

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] the distinction between the requests made by the two gentlemen to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] referred, is this:

In part 1, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] asks for permission to extend his remarks in four instances in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. The other request was to extend remarks in one instance, and to include four articles.

Mr. Speaker, that might represent a fine distinction but there is a limitation

on the amount that can be expended on any one extension in the RECORD.

I would call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and request that when the RECORD appears tomorrow the gentleman refer to the statement which I made at the beginning of this session today explaining the reason I was making these objections today.

While I am not setting myself up as a censor, while I am on my feet I think there are others present in the Chamber who can concur in what I am attempting to do. I am now soliciting volunteers to assist me in this effort and thereby save some money in the printing of the RECORD and bring about some semblance of order and commonsense in the application of the Rules of the House. I will welcome the cooperation of any Members.

Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting to set myself up as a censor in this regard but I am merely trying to call attention to some of the things that have been going on which I do not think are in the interest of the taxpayers of America.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I ask the gentleman, in all kindness and friendship—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be given 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that at this point such unanimous-consent request is not in order and cannot be entertained by the Chair.

VIOLATIONS OF AIRSPACE OVER THE UNITED STATES BY CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard again that the territorial waters of the United States are being violated by Russian trawlers.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called this fact to the attention of the Members of the House as well as to the State Department that the Communists, through Cuba, are also violating the airspace over the United States and have been doing so for some time. The only answer which I have been able to secure from the executive branch of the Government is the fact that the FAA issued a regulation to permit Cuban airlines, nonscheduled, to overfly the United States as long as they landed at one of the major airports, which includes Dulles Airport, located right outside of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I brought to the attention of the Government, and objected as well to U.S. citizens going to Cuba

through Mexico for training in subversion. The answer to that was that the Mexican Government would not cut off such travel and that, therefore, we could not cut it off since this was outside the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have communicated with representatives of the executive branch of the Government about this, and the first reply I received was the President's talk yesterday when he said that the United States must, in fact, reexamine its attitude toward Russia; that we must increase our understanding between the United States and Russia. Also, to do this we must increase communications. This evidently means the travel of U.S. citizens to Cuba, the flight of Cuban airplanes over the United States, and even the violation of our territorial waters by Communist trawlers.

OBJECTIONS TO UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] who seems to be acting as minority leader today, the fact that when he says there is some responsibility on the part of the majority leader to protect the rights of the Members of the House with respect to unanimous-consent requests, that that same responsibility devolves upon the minority leader of the House insofar as unanimous-consent requests are concerned.

What caused my objection to the special orders the other day was the fact that for the first time in 15 years I requested a special order, and it was objected to by a Member on the minority side.

Mr. Speaker, I am not being partisan about it, but I am objecting to all special orders.

In view of the fact that it is reported frequently in the press that we will be here until November, if we can keep these special orders from being taken which consume several hours a day, perhaps we can get out in October.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] may be permitted the opportunity in one instance to insert his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include therein four newspaper articles.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object on the ground that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is here I think

he can make his own request. I, therefore, object to the request of the other gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman already addressed the House for 1 minute today?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets that the gentleman's request is not in order at this time. The Chair wants to be very liberal, but he must enforce the procedures that exist at this particular period of the day's proceedings.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has been denied through the objection of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], that they be included in one request. What I am trying to say is that there are four different subjects, and they could not possibly fit into one request.

Therefore, I want to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that I cannot tie them in together.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman speaking on the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that the gentleman's observations, of course, will be a part of the RECORD.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter from Ambassador J. H. van Roijen, of the Netherlands, on the death of our late colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from Dr. J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador, in reference to the death of our late colleague Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 10, 1963.
The Honorable JOHN McCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Netherlands Minister of Social Affairs has asked me to transmit to you the expression of his deep-felt sympathy on the occasion of the untimely death of Congressman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania. The Minister wishes me to add that the Netherlands emigration authorities, who owe so much to the late Congressman Walter's interest in their problems and in the plight of the refugees in general, will always remember Congressman Walter with sincere gratitude.

I should be most grateful if this message of condolence could be passed on to the family of Congressman Walter through your kind intermediary.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Speaker,

Very sincerely yours,

J. H. VAN ROIJEN,
Netherlands Ambassador.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not exceed 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6868, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we present today the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1964. At the outset I should like to express my appreciation to two new members of the subcommittee who worked directly on the bill with us this year, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN]. Also, of course, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] who have been on this subcommittee for some years.

I am proud to be able to tell the House that they worked hard and faithfully on this bill, and we have tried to bring our annual housekeeping bill to the membership in as good order and in as good form as is practicable for us to do. We have tried to extend the hearings on the affairs of the Congress in the hearings, so that all who desired to know more of the detail of what we do and why we do it might have that information. We have supported the bill this year with a more lengthy report than usual in a further effort to bring to the membership and to the country more detail about our housekeeping affairs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before you totals \$140,038,919. This is a reduction of \$8,541,326 from the budget estimate but \$22,020,509 above the appropriations for the same items in fiscal 1963. I include a table here.

Summary of the bill

Group	Appropriations, 1963 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1964	Committee bill, 1964	Committee bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964
House of Representatives	\$40,520,130	\$50,772,950	\$50,131,550	+\$611,420	—\$641,400
Joint items	5,380,660	6,297,515	6,271,369	+\$80,709	—26,146
Architect of the Capitol (excludes Senate items)	16,350,750	31,398,500	30,744,200	+14,393,450	—654,300
Botanic Garden	452,000	483,000	482,000	+10,000	—21,000
Library of Congress	19,905,340	21,252,400	20,487,800	+532,460	—764,600
Government Printing Office	26,409,530	38,375,880	31,942,000	+5,532,470	—6,433,880
Total (excludes all Senate items)	118,018,410	148,580,245	140,038,919	+22,020,509	—8,541,326

NOTE.—Includes all appropriations for 1963 (including the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963) and all budget estimates for 1964 for items covered to date of reporting of this bill. Omits all items pertaining to the Senate.

Part of the reason for the increase in the total amount of money provided for in this bill over 1963 has been brought about by the general pay increases common to all the bills and other increased costs, some of which have been caused by an increase in the volume of work in some of the agencies contained in this bill, and the remainder has been because of the inclusion of a number of nonrecurring capital investment items. As a matter of fact, the new nonrecurring capital items in this bill more than exceed \$23 million. The approval of this bill will bring the capital investment program that has been underway on Capitol Hill for the last 15 years much closer to a final windup. The \$20 million provided for in this bill for the new House office building and other improvements, the purchase of a great amount of land, and the clearing of that land, the con-

struction of the House office building and its equipment, and other authorized items will make that total investment to date come to \$114 million. We can now expect a very sizable decrease in this part of the bill next year, even if some other authorized items are finally decided upon for prosecution.

About the only major item we will have left next year in the way of major construction if this bill is approved, so far as we now know, will be about \$4,237,000 to finish up the work around the new House Office Building and the new garage proposed in this bill. Of course, nothing has yet been authorized for a very badly needed new Library Building. And there is the matter of remodeling the two existing buildings.

In addition to the money provided here for carrying on and completing much of the capital investment work, we have in

the bill \$8,500,000 as a capital item to bring the revolving fund of the Government Printing Office up to needs. This is an operating item needed to handle the ever-increasing volume of work.

We also have in here one capital investment item that will be nonrecurring of \$2,225,000 to provide for a new water and sewer system for the main Library of Congress Building. The building is 66 years old and the plumbing has become so badly deteriorated that there is no way it can be successfully repaired; we have included this with some other smaller capital items for that institution. There may be a few other items come along for that old building.

We have deleted a capital item asked for to start a warehouse at the Government Printing Office. That item will probably be back in another year or so. They had to call off the project temporarily until they can bring it into conformity with some of the redevelopment plans currently involved in that area of Washington.

There will probably be a few more items that the Congress will probably be asked to take up in the next few years, having to do with the final completion of the long-range capital investment program that has been undertaken. But that is for the future.

Since the end of World War II, and at the time when this whole program of capital investment will be finished, in probably the next year or so, we will have invested some \$280 million in new land, buildings, tunnels, facilities, and replacements, in all the Capitol properties and other institutions supported in this bill.

It might be helpful to present some information on the New House Office Building. There seems to be more misinformation noised around than there is information. In the hope that I might put the record straight, there are a few statistics in connection with that building I would like to give the House at this time. This is a building that will have a final cost of about \$71 million-plus, with fixtures and equipment running the total overall cost to about \$80,350,000. That includes, besides the building itself, the purchase of the land and building of the sewer under it, the architectural and engineering fees, and the furniture and furnishings. You will recall that earlier this session \$3,500,000 was authorized to buy the furniture and furnishings needed for the New House Office Building, or the Rayburn Building, as it will be known. The figures are on page 13 of the committee report and they are in the printed hearings. This building when completed will have a gross square foot area of 2,375,000 square feet. The gross square foot area, excluding the garage in the building, will be 1,373,000 square feet. The net usable space will be 935,000 square feet. The cubic content of the building will be 33,600,000 cubic feet of space.

The cost of the building, if we are successful in keeping the actual cost to the \$71.5 million figure that now seems possible, will average approximately \$30 per square foot of gross space. The cost per cubic foot of space on this cost figure will be \$.213. The national average for

comparative buildings as given by the Engineering News Record, December 1962, which is supposed to be an authority, is \$29.13 a square foot and \$2.10 a cubic foot. That means that the cost of this building is almost exactly that of the national average for comparable types of buildings.

To give a little better comparison, these are underway in the city of Washington now certain Government buildings that are costing more than \$30 a square foot, and there are many privately constructed office buildings going up in this part of the country and other metropolitan areas costing more than the \$30 average.

We had cited to us, for instance, one building in New York City where the square foot cost is about \$45. While the amount of money involved here is large, this also happens to be a very large building. We have space in this building for the parking of some 1,600 cars. There are three-room suites for 169 Members. There are 9 major committee rooms with the attendant service rooms and conference rooms, telephone rooms, and so forth, as well as staff rooms; 16 subcommittee rooms, 5 dining rooms, a cafeteria seating 700 plus people and considerable space for the various service units, like health rooms, and things of that sort.

We believe that on any basis of comparison this building is in line with what would be considered good practice as to its utility, as to its cost and as to its probable longstanding permanency.

I thought the Members would like to know some of these figures because there has been so much said about the building, and unfortunately not enough of it has been accurate.

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

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Turning to page 196 of the hearings, it states that:

A total of \$94 million has been appropriated for the additional House Office Building project to date.

Mr. STEED. As I said, there are a lot of items connected with this investment program other than the third office building itself. My remarks here are confined to one part of the program, the building itself. The cost of land, equipment and furniture, the sewer, and engineering fees, added to the actual building cost will run the total to about \$80 million. In addition to that we have over the years purchased other land and have made other constructions, including the proposed garages, the East Front Extension and work for the body on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. How can you put the west front under the language contained here that I have just read, a total of \$94 million appropriated for the House Office Building project to date? How do you get the west part of the Capitol in the additional House Office Building project to date?

Mr. STEED. There is no west front money now in the bill, or ever. There is money in the bill for the east front, under a separate appropriation, but the

work the gentleman is speaking of; elevators and that sort of thing, is part of the cost of the tunnel connecting the Capitol to the Rayburn Building, and that is included in this \$118,237,000 that will have been spent when the whole project, including all items is finished somewhere in the next 2 or 3 years. We have already for all these purposes, under the some appropriation head, which includes the House Office Building itself, appropriated \$94 million. We have \$20 million more in this bill, which will bring the total to \$114 million. Then there still would be estimated obligations outstanding of \$4,237,000 as of June 1964 for work done up to that time. The new House Office Building is part of this whole program. The difficulty comes, the confusion often comes, by erroneously assuming or believing that the cost of the whole program, including the cost of land and everything else that has gone on, was all for the third or additional House Office Building itself but as a matter of fact it is not the whole program by some \$30 million to date.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying this building is ever going to be completed?

Mr. STEED. It will be; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. GROSS. If it is completed it will be at a total cost of approximately \$80 million, is that correct, ready to go, \$80 million?

Mr. STEED. That is the best figure the Architect of the Capitol can give us at this point. I think it will probably prove to be accurate.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the swimming pool?

Mr. STEED. That does include the swimming pool, the gymnasiums, and everything you have heard about that is in the building.

Mr. GROSS. It is now up to \$71 million, and it will be completed for \$9 million more. Is that correct?

Mr. STEED. What I have done in trying to make this clear is probably confusing the gentleman. As to the building itself, you had to buy the land, you had to have the architectural and engineering fees and the furniture and furnishings. We have tried to group all that together in a total item, a lump sum of \$80 million, approximately. If you do not include that you have a building that costs you \$71.5 million. I am trying to make this clear to the House without confusing the issue. The \$80 million includes the architectural and engineering fees, the purchase of the land on which the building stands, the purchase of the furniture and equipment, and those items. In addition, we have made other investments by including the east front extension, the purchase of several acres of land, and clearing it, and things like that.

Mr. GROSS. I have read the hearings. I could find only one paragraph in the hearings on the swimming pool. I found nothing in the report on the swimming pool. I note one member of the Building Commission is sitting very close to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Can the gentleman from Georgia, if the gentleman from Oklahoma cannot do it, tell

me what this swimming pool is going to cost?

Mr. STEED. That has not been determined yet.

Mr. GROSS. When do you expect it to be determined?

Mr. STEED. Very soon, in negotiations with the contractor. I hope the gentleman does not insist that it be in the record today. That might encourage the contractor to want to charge us more for getting the work done than if we gave him a chance to work it out. I can tell the gentleman the size of the swimming pool is only 20 by 60 feet.

Mr. GROSS. What will be taken out to make room for the swimming pool?

Mr. STEED. Nothing is being taken out.

Mr. GROSS. Why did you have to have a change in the specifications or whatever it was in the plans?

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman wants that sort of detail, I think in fairness to the committee, he ought to go to the field office where the architects and the engineers can show him copies of the contract and blueprints and all those details. I do not have all those things with me and I make no pretense of knowing all the details.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I want to thank the gentleman first for trying to clarify this, but in response to his final statement, there have been individuals who have gone to whom we thought were knowledgeable people on this project and they could not get the information. I call your attention to page 272 of the hearings where Mr. Roberts, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, said:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is the time to bring it up, but talking about the Rayburn Building, as far as economy and service is concerned, I wrote the architect a letter in 1962 about space for a new stationery room, file room, library, and property custodian. I have not received any answer so far. If they are going to provide those quarters, if they would do it now it would result in a big saving to the Government rather than wait until the building is completed and then tear it all up and provide those rooms.

Now the Clerk of the House of Representatives apparently has not been able to get an answer on what is going where in this building or if it, indeed, is going to have any facilities.

Mr. STEED. There again you get into a situation which is not quite as simple as the gentleman might think. The assignment of space on the House side, as the gentleman knows, begins with the Speaker. There have been certain designations of authority. Now what the powers that be are going to do with this space, I do not think anybody is in a position to tell you at this time. I do believe provisions have been made for every foreseeable need, and since there will be for the time being some surplus space, I cannot conceive of anybody or any function or any section having to do with the service of the House of Representatives being unable to get suitable quarters, if they can show the need for it. I do not believe there is going to be

any need for modification or repairs or changes that is going to involve any great amount of money.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. When the gentleman cited some figures concerning the comparative costs of buildings by private industry and with this Government building, is the cost figure for the new House Office Building, the Rayburn Building, computed on the basis of all the cubic feet and all the square feet of the garage?

Mr. STEED. We gave each its part. I thought I tried to make that clear as to the gross space and the net usable space.

Mr. KYL. In other words, we are comparing garage space with office space in a private building; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Oh, no, we break that down too. The gross square foot area of the building excluding the garage is 1,373,000 of which there is 935,000 square feet of usable space in that part of the building, which does not include the garage.

Mr. KYL. The Pentagon which is the biggest office building in the world up to this time cost \$83 million. In New York the newest and most luxurious skyscraper, the Seagram Building which is a metal and glass structure 38 stories high, cost \$41 million. I will bet you they knew what the cost of the Seagram Building was going to be before they had it under construction.

Mr. STEED. I am advised that the Seagram Building cost \$45 per square foot as against our \$30 per square foot.

Mr. KYL. But it does not have a three story garage in the basement?

Mr. STEED. I personally do not know, but the figures I used were given to me as being comparative costs. I got them from the Architect. I believe them to be correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. On pages 11 and 12 of the report of the committee I notice discussion about the extension of the western face of the Capitol.

I hope that the committee will see to it that Congress is well advised and notified long in advance of any proposal to spend any money for the extension of the west front of the Capitol.

The reason why I make these remarks is because in the language which appears on page 12 of the report there is reference to the necessity of getting it underway because of the monolithic columns which are to be erected.

My feeling about this is illustrated by what happened before the Armed Services Committee. Not long ago that committee, and also Congress, were allowed the privilege of looking at the design for the Air Force Academy Chapel. There were feelings both for and against what ultimately transpired. There are now feelings for and against what may be done to the western face of the Capitol. When it is erected, if it is going to be a new face, we will cover then the last portion of the 18th Century portion of the Capitol now available for public view.

The public will no longer be able to view any exterior part of the Capitol which was built prior to 1800 when and if this is done.

I think there are some substantial historical esthetic and financial views which should be considered in any discussion of the extension of the western portion of the Capitol. Of course, there is only one comment in the bill that I can see which has any reference to the extension of the Capitol and that appears on lines 10, 11, and 12 of page 12 of the report.

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to give the gentleman from Florida some information on this subject. The \$700,000 which is contained in this bill winds up the east front extension of the Capitol, and here again, the total appropriations covered reach more than the extension per se, as the committee report sets forth on page 11. There is no money in here for the west front. The Committee on Appropriations merely calls the attention of the Congress to a situation which exists, because in our opinion the Congress is either going to have to face that situation or take the responsibility for not doing so. If the Engineers know what they are talking about the building is deteriorating. Nature takes its toll. Since we had this information we felt it was our duty to call it to the attention of the House.

The gentleman might be interested to know that we have been told that the special joint commission which planned for the construction of the east front also has authority in the same law to proceed with the west front.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think the Members of Congress knew that when they passed that law.

Mr. STEED. I am trying to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that it is important to know about this and assume if proper notice is given to responsible House Members and Members of the other body that in due time and in their own way they will find the proper answer to it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one further statement. I hope I am one who believes in saving every penny we can. But there are certain responsibilities that just have to be met. In total, however liberal or however tight you make it, I think it is important for us to put it in perspective. This bill in toto—this is one of the three branches of the Government, the legislative branch, and we have to carry the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office and some other activities—as compared against the total Federal budget, is in the same relationship that a 5-cent piece is to a \$1,000 bill. However, I do not think that just because it is a minute part of the total Federal budget there should be any waste in it. But I do think it is important for the Members to realize its perspective in regard to what the total cost of the Federal operations amounts to and where it lies.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I know the sincerity of my good friend from Oklahoma. We served on the same committee some years ago. I read in the paper the other day that now we find blank walls instead of stone walls, and where there should be a door from the Member's office into the regular business office.

Mr. STEED. Let me tell the gentleman that when the 169 Members occupy the Rayburn building there are some who may like to have an additional door at a particular place as we have discussed. In the building as they are now building it, that spot happens to be a coat closet for the administrative assistant. It will be a very inexpensive matter to have a door put through there, if the Members want it, and if the powers that be will let them do it. It would depend to a great extent on how many Members want to make the change.

Mr. BECKER. As I read it in the paper, this was a mistake.

Mr. STEED. There was no mistake. A door can be put there. It is a matter of personal opinion as to whether that needs to be done. At the time the suggestion was made it was thought it would be nicer to have the extra door. An estimate was made as to what it would cost to put the doors in. That is the figure the gentleman has. So it was decided not to do that. We are not putting the door in. We are putting in a little clothes closet. At some future date, if a Member insisted on having a door there, and if the Speaker and the committee in charge is willing to permit a door to be put there, it could be put there at nominal cost.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman will concede it is a most peculiar situation when a Member or a businessman in a private office must go through the reception room to get to where his employees are working, rather than to go from his office direct. I think that is a rather peculiar architectural design.

Mr. STEED. Has the gentleman been over to see the building?

Mr. BECKER. Not recently, since this has developed.

Mr. STEED. It is pretty hard to describe the physical layout. I think if the gentleman went over to see it he would find it is a matter of interest to some Members to have the extra door, whereas many other Members would not want a door. It is a matter of opinion as to whether or not a door should be there or not.

What I am trying to say is that if the gentleman from New York thinks it is important to have a door there, that door can be made available to him at a nominal cost if he occupies a suite in that building.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing here today a reasonable explanation of some of the things that have been worrying many Members of Congress. What has happened, of course, is past and gone. The gentleman is trying to clear up some of the things in which there has been a great deal of misunder-

standing. It is not the fault of the gentleman now presenting the bill or the report.

I think the real cause of this is lack of information that the Members of the Congress have had or less information that you would normally expect on a project so close to the Congress. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] should not be criticized. If anyone should be criticized, it is the Commission who have charge of this program who have not kept Congress informed as to what they were doing. There has been a tremendous amount of expenditures here. Of course, the Congress is spending public money, and I think they should have had an opportunity, and I refer to Members of the Congress, to know what was going on, but that has not been possible heretofore.

Mr. STEED. I may say this, that our committee has had the finest cooperation from everybody that has anything to do with this, and we have tried for the last 3 years, especially the last 2 years, to get on record as many details about what we were doing as we possibly could. And, I think we have put the essential details in the record, and I know that the Members do need to know this. I am sorry that some Members apparently do not read the hearings, or do not read the reports, or do not make inquiry and try to help us get more information. I think we all might be saved a lot of criticism and difficulty if we had a way to get more of the facts truly told to the public. We need these facilities, and I think we are getting a pretty good run for our money. We only have the comparison of what other people have to pay for similar construction, but on the basis of any comparison I know how to make, it seems to me we are pretty much in line with private industry throughout the country.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that coming here and explaining some of these things I think has thrown a good deal of light on some of these things that there has been some misunderstanding on. As far as I am concerned, there should be no criticism of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He has done the best he could with the information available. If there has been a lack of information, it must of necessity fall back on the people who developed these things and not the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I will say to the gentleman from Florida we not only had a lot of misinformation about it and misunderstanding, but before we get through I expect there will be more, and with my name being on the bill, I will be the target. But, if the Members have any confidence in our committee, I have nothing to worry about.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether you have taken any notice in the questions that have been asked, about sinks. There has been the matter of doors that I understand has been discussed here today; the

door going from the assistants' office to the work office. The only way for the Member to get into the work office is through the reception room. I know you have discussed that. But, I do not know whether you have taken up the matter of putting in the sink pipes but no sinks. The answer I get from the people who are building it is "Those are the orders." Then anybody that has to use the pipes to fit the sinks has to tear it all out again, and that is double work. Why do we have to pay twice?

Mr. STEED. They tell me that the building is so equipped that if at some future date after occupancy a Member or Members wanted a sink, a sink could be installed. I do not know what the cost would be. We have had no estimate on it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I think it would be necessary to have an estimate on it.

Mr. STEED. Personally I do not know whether a Member would need a sink or not. There is one in the bathroom right across the hall.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. That is not a sink; that is a wash basin.

Mr. STEED. There are facilities included in this building that may be brought in at some future date, in the conduits for electric lines, for instance; the anticipation that some day in the future we may need more telephone circuits; the anticipation that some day there may be some sort of electrical signal system for the Members. There might even be closed television some day. They have tried to plan and design the building so that some of these standby features would be included when it was built, to obviate enormous costs to do it later. And, it is my understanding that that is part of the reason the plumbing was arranged so that if at some future date you needed a sink, one could be installed.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Well, I happen to be a Connecticut Yankee, and I like to get my money's worth. But, to pay twice for the same thing is stupid.

Mr. STEED. I am afraid if sinks were put in every suite, you would find many Members not needing them.

If the gentlewoman from Ohio can ever find anything we do around here that pleases all the Members, I would like to know it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I understand that too, but you do not have a woman on the committee, which is most unfortunate.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to put myself on record. I go back home asking my constituents to vote for me. When they come down here to Washington I do not run away from them. I do not understand this feeling of opposition because Members of Congress have to walk from their private office through the public office where their constituents are in order to reach the House. I do not understand this, and I think I am voicing the general sentiment of the House. My door is never closed. I do

not have any private office. I do not want to have a lot of doors where I can secrete myself from my constituents. I want their votes and I want to serve them when they come here. They are my boss.

Mr. STEED. The Member does have a direct entrance from the corridor to his private office and if he wants to he can probably escape without anybody catching him.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do not want to escape from my constituents, but I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma on the great job he is doing.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I want to congratulate the gentleman greatly. I think he has done a tremendous job along with the other members of the committee in an almost impossible situation. I do not know whether it ever occurred to anyone or not that if they wanted to see someone in the other office they could just push a button and ring a buzzer. I think all of this business about having doors cut through is a little bit ridiculous. I am a little like the gentleman from Illinois. If I live long enough to see that building completed—and I hope to live another 30 years, but I am not betting that I am going to see it completed—I would hope to have a suite there. I will take it the way it is, without cutting a door in it.

There is a question I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, which is this: I read in the paper this morning that the Department of Defense is going to rent all eight floors in a new office building over in Fairfax County. The article went on to say that the caissons were down and the foundations were in and they will start erecting the steel structure next week, and that the building will be occupied in November. If the gentleman can tell me what in the name of common sense has been going on here for the past 6 years, that they have not been able to finish that building. I will guarantee that it is some kind of a new record for the length of time needed to complete a building. Is it because the Architect of the Capitol does not know his business, which I suspect may be the truth?

Mr. STEED. No, I think if the gentleman will read the contracts, it is because of the enormous size of the building, and the conditions encountered, and so on. It has not been an undue length of time. There was a delay occasioned that delayed everybody involving a creek which they ran into and provision had to be made to take care of that. That held it up for many months.

Mr. HAYS. I know about that.

Mr. STEED. But aside from that this building is within 70 percent of completion and they tell me they are on schedule and on time according to the plans.

Mr. HAYS. I understand they are on schedule, but is there anything to the rumor going around here that this build-

ing is on a cost-plus basis? Is that correct?

Mr. STEED. No. It is on competitive bid.

Mr. HAYS. I understand. At least it was said here in our committee this morning that this thing is being scheduled and delayed so that the contractor does not get too much income in any one income tax period, and he can spread it out and pay less tax. What about that?

Mr. STEED. I do not know anything about that. That is something I have not heard of before. I will say this, by the time he gets through paying some of the penalties he will have to pay for delay under his contract he may not have any tax problem.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to say that this is a great investigation-minded place around here, and you might start an investigation of the Office of the Architect to see what comes out of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to comment on the more important matters, but I want to compliment the chairman and his committee for some language they have at the top of page 6 of the report, where mention is made of the lack of receptacles for cigarettes. I know that up here, when we bring our guests in, if they want to dispose of their cigarettes, there is not even a receptacle to put them in. I am pleased the committee recognizes that situation.

It is also mentioned that some people feel that the marble on this side of the Capitol is not as well kept as the marble on that side. I do not know if it is a good idea to wax that marble, because just this morning, as I walked over there for early morning breakfast, they just got through waxing the floor on the other side of the Capitol, and it is almost like skating on ice. I think it is quite dangerous. We have so many visitors here, I wonder if it is wise to wax our floors to the high degree of polish as they do over there.

I just offer that as an observation.

Mr. STEED. There could be something to what the gentleman says. We should be glad to look into that, give some thought to it, to see what may be done. The reference to waxing in the committee report was to the tile floor on the gallery floor.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I think it ought to be said here that we have provided some additional jobs, most of which are in agencies that are self-supporting. It may interest the Members to know that of the \$140 million in this bill, between \$10 and \$11 million of it is recaptured in fees collected by three major agencies that are financed in this activity. There is another \$4,867,000 in the bill as a payment to the Post Office Department for the use of the frank. That is a bookkeeping transaction. The costs have already been paid to the Post Office Department and all this item does is to shift in the budget the responsibility for that amount from the Post

Office Department to the Congress. That, again, is something that serves to make the bill less expensive than might appear on the surface. None of the \$8,500,000 added capital for the Printing Office results in additional drain on the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I include selected excerpts from the committee report on this bill so that this RECORD will be more comprehensive in explanation than the time has allowed here this afternoon:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL TOTALS

As shown by this table, the committee is recommending total appropriations of \$140,038,919, a reduction of \$8,541,326, close to 6 percent below corresponding budget estimates of \$148,580,245. The budget for items embraced by the bill was \$30,561,835 above corresponding appropriations for 1963. Thus, the bill as reported is \$23,020,509 above appropriations for 1963.

The legislative appropriation bill has been fluctuating somewhat from year to year depending significantly on requirements for construction and remodeling projects being initiated, accelerated, or terminated. There is the added factor this year—common to all the appropriation bills—of annualizing in fiscal 1964 the general pay raise which was effective last October. Under the same law classification act employees of the Library and the Architect get an additional increase in January 1964 and provision has been made for that in these appropriations. A few figures will highlight the situation and put the comparative totals in better perspective.

\$11,500,000 of the \$22,020,509 increase over 1963 is to meet accruing obligations on the Rayburn office building project including two underground garages. Another \$8,500,000 increase is to supply the Printing Office with additional working capital attendant upon a significant increase in the volume of business handled; this does not add to total overall expenditure from the Treasury since the operation is on a reimbursable cost basis. \$2,225,000 is included for replacement of the badly deteriorated, 66-year-old water and sewer system in the main library building. There are sundry other non-recurring items, but just these three add to \$22,225,000. There is a partially off-setting reduction of \$6,450,000 from 1963 on account of dropping the item provided last year for a fire-proof annex warehouse for the Printing Office; but as indicated later, that has not been expended and will not be at least until some future year.

There is a \$3 million increase for congressional printing and binding; \$2,500,000 of it is the overrun in fiscal 1962 costs as compared to the overrun in 1961, the other \$500,000 being the Public Printer's judgment—necessarily somewhat of a guess—of the fiscal 1964 obligations as compared to the 1963 estimated obligations for the many classes of printing covered. Wages, materials, and volume enter the calculation. Then there is an increase of \$170,000 for the additional telephone and telegraph allowances voted in House Resolution 735 of the 87th Congress. Still another item is an increase of \$881,374 for reimbursing the postal revenues for franked mailings during fiscal year 1962. That is a bookkeeping matter; the money was spent in 1962. That cost will very likely be even higher in the next two budgets when the full effect of the general postal pay increases of October 1962 and January 1964 come into the calculation.

The increase of \$287,630 over last year for the card distribution service in the Library will be more than recouped to the Treasury through card sales receipts. The same can be said of the appropriation for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents for which an increase of \$482,470 is allowed. The increase of \$268,000 shown for the spe-

cial foreign currency program of the Library is not a dollar drain on the Treasury; it represents the proposed use of excess currencies already owned.

What we are saying is that the totals of the bill are far from indicative of the change in the overall level of recurring-type expenditures. There are a few places where the committee felt justified in allowing some modest recurring increases. Only nine additional employees have been allowed under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden and these are in the lower-level mechanical and laborer categories. Small increases have been allowed in the Copyright Office, a partially self-supporting service, and in the Legislative Reference Service to handle rising workloads. The same is true in the catalog card service which, as noted, is more than self-sustaining. Altogether, roughly 65 to 70 additional employees out of a total of 108 net additional requested are allowed throughout the Library. To meet an increasing sales workload and to partially implement the new depository library law, 16 additional positions have been allowed to the Superintendent of Documents; here again, the entire amount is recovered through sales receipts.

Except for a slight increase for electrical energy, the bill does not reflect the impact of maintenance and operations associated with the Rayburn Office Building. That will come in the next budget.

One other detail as to the bill generally. All joint committees are included in the accompanying bill. Heretofore, under a long-standing arrangement, those disbursed by the Senate (Joint Economic Committee, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Joint Committee on Printing) have not been included in the bill reported to the House. The new arrangement affords opportunity for equal original review in both Houses.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Items under this heading total \$50,131,550, a reduction of \$641,400 from the budget estimates and \$611,420 above 1963 appropriations. Most of the increases are attributable to annualization of the general pay raise of last fall. A principal addition of \$170,000 for 10,000 telephone and telegraph "units" authorized by House Resolution 735 of the 87th Congress.

Otherwise, for many offices and departments the amounts are merely a dollar translation of the statutory roll of authorized employees where the requirements occur, often with little or no change, from year to year. On the other hand, some objects are not subject to precise estimating in advance, being educated guesses of what the dollar demands will be, as, for example, special and select committee expenses incurred pursuant to resolutions of the House; the volume of committee hearings; employment by the standing committees within discretionary limits fixed by law; the number of clerks on Members' office rolls; the needs for additional filing cabinets, office furniture, and the like; this is also true of the printing appropriation, directly dependent on the number of session days; the number of bills and reports; the extensiveness of the body and Appendix of the Record. No one can foresee the requirements with precision.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Appropriations to the Architect provide for operation, maintenance, and repair of the physical plant of the Legislative establishment, except the Government Printing Office which does its own, and for major improvement and construction projects specifically authorized from time to time. Following custom, the bill omits provision for items under the Architect pertaining exclusively to the Senate.

Each year, these budgets show a number of changes and the committee generally goes

along with some of them in the interest of maintaining the physical plant in reasonably good order. There has been some catching up to be done. In addition, various mandatory cost increases, recurring in character, such as wage-board and within-grade promotions under existing law, repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation work as the physical plan ages, and similar costs have to be met. The Architect is also responsible, and this section of the bill includes the funds, for structural and mechanical care of the Library buildings and for furniture and furnishings for them.

Total appropriations recommended in the bill aggregate \$30,744,200, a reduction of \$654,300 from the budget requests but \$14,393,450 above corresponding 1963 appropriation. The ups and downs are shown by appropriation item in the table of this report; the main items are touched on in the following paragraphs. Every personnel item involves annualization of the general pay raise of last fall, annualization of wage-board increases determined under existing law, and similar mandatory items.

In all items considered, the Architect requested only 13 additional positions under this general heading and the committee has allowed 7 of them—4 laborers for the Capitol Grounds work, a stonemason for the House Office Buildings, and 2 mechanical type employees for the powerplant.

The Rayburn Office Building project and associated items account for \$11,500,000 of the \$14,393,450 increase over 1963. Another \$2,225,000 is to replace the 66-year-old water and sewer systems in the main Library building. There are some other nonrecurring items included; some are noted below and all are listed in the hearings. The 1965 appropriations should total substantially less.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

For all items under this heading \$20,487,800 is recommended, a reduction in direct appropriations requested for the Library of \$764,600 although on a basis comparable to the budget request, only \$506,600 because of the inclusion in the bill of a transfer of \$258,000 from the National Science Foundation to continue preparation and publication of the valuable monthly index of Russian accessions for which the Library sought a direct appropriation. The total in the bill is a net increase of \$582,460 above corresponding 1963 appropriations. The Russian accessions index is a going activity currently financed with an advance of funds from the National Science Foundation. Appropriations for furniture and furnishings and for structural and mechanical care are budgeted under the Architect and are in addition to the figures just cited.

In common with other appropriations involving personnel, a number of increases over 1963 are partially explained by the annualization of the general pay raise of last fall and provision for the further increase scheduled for classification act employees in January 1964. There are, also, the more or less annually recurring increments for such things as within-grade increases under existing law, wage board increases and reallocations of positions.

Not all is an ultimate charge on the Treasury. The \$287,630 additional for the catalog card operation, for example, will be recouped through the sale of cards—income now approximates \$3 million, more than covering the entire cost. Another \$268,000 of the increase over 1963 is under the experimental foreign currency program and goes from one pocket to another in the Treasury. The Copyright Office returns over \$1 million annually although it is not completely self-supporting because fees charged have not kept pace with the increased cost.

This is the Nation's largest research library if not in fact the world's largest. In the nature of things, some increase is inevitable.

A first-class library either grows or stagnates; it does not stand still and remain first-class. Its collections, the demands upon it, and thus its volume of work will continue to experience steady growth. For example, something like 40 pieces of material come to the library every minute of an 8-hour day. About 8 pieces enter the permanent collection. This is an unceasing day-in and day-out process.

Approximately 664,000 additions of all types were made to the collections in fiscal 1962; in fiscal 1961, the number was 1,810,000 pieces when an unusually large number of manuscripts were added. For many years the Library has experienced chronic arrearages in the arranging, cataloging, indexing, shelving, and servicing of the vast, priceless, and ever-increasing collections. The intake is of limited value, unless it is cataloged and readied for use. But the situation is seriously aggravated by lack of space. The buildings are bulging at the seams. Each year, inevitably, the time comes closer when there will be no more room to house the collections or to accommodate the people who service them. Overcrowding and inefficient work arrangements continue to persist—and get worse all the time. Improvising and physical rearranging of the work is a common occurrence.

A third building is badly needed—now. Something ought to be done about it. After 3 years of trying to provide some relief, arrangements were finally completed last year for renovation of some space at the Naval Weapons Plant to house some of the activities, principally the moneymaking catalog card service, that do not need to be in proximity to the collections. There has been some further delay; it is now said that occupancy will take place in April 1964. Even so, it will be only a minor and temporary measure of relief for the overcrowding. It does nothing to contribute to the long-range solution.

This is a great cultural and research institution and in the committee's view ought to be brought to a good state of accommodation and efficiency at an early date. Although originally conceived and established as the Library of Congress, it is in fact, by reason of many congressional actions over a long period of years, the national library of the United States and of inestimable value to the Nation's library facilities at all levels. And it is appropriate to again recall that many Federal agencies, not insignificantly including the defense and security agencies, as disclosed by the tabulations at page 47 of the hearings, continue to use the vast resources by allocating several million dollars annually to the Library for specialized and analytical projects.

There have been suggestions over the years, renewed recently, that the Library of Congress ought to be officially designated as the National Library of the United States and its administration shifted to the Executive Branch. There is a considerable reservoir of feeling in the committee against such a proposition of transfer and, very likely, that feeling would be shared by many Members of the Congress. The Library is a unique institution. A good many of its services are intimately and peculiarly adapted, in harmony with the original design, for service to the Congress and its committees. Others are national in character and scope. As to the matter of designation, it has been said that custom and tradition are stronger than the law. There would, likely, be considerable opposition to a change of the name although there would appear to be merit in a formal designation of the Library as the National Library. There are now two specialized libraries so designated formally—one in the field of agriculture and the other in the field of medicine. But even so, it could be said to be a distinction without benefit of the substance of much difference.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

For the operation of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents \$5,242,000 is recommended, a reduction of \$175,880 from the request and \$482,470 above the 1963 appropriation. Roundly, \$277,000 of the increase is to finance the old established program including the 12 new low-grade clerical positions requested. Sales of publications continue to increase; \$5,770,101 was returned to the Treasury in 1962; \$5,800,000 is estimated for 1963 and \$6,000,000 for 1964—more than covering the entire cost of both revenue and non-revenue functions. The remaining \$206,000 budget increase is associated with the new depository library law (Public Law 87-579) which, briefly, provided for the designation of additional depository libraries, relieved depository libraries of publication mailing costs, and widened the sweep of publications available to the libraries by requiring the Superintendent of Documents to secure selected publications printed by the other Government agencies at their own plants and distribute them to the depository libraries. To begin implementation of the new law, the budget sought a total of \$381,000, including 25 additional employees, of which approximately \$175,000 and 21 people are directly identified with the acquisition and distribution of non-GPO printed material.

The committee has not allowed the additional money for this non-GPO publications feature. Additional libraries are in the process of being designated; something like 100 either have been or were assumed to be designated for the purpose of making up this budget. The committee has allowed enough funds to extend to these additional libraries the same publications distribution as has obtained over the years for the 600-odd existing depository libraries. All libraries are henceforth relieved of publication postage expense.

As to the non-GPO publications, the Superintendent is beginning to explore with the agencies the ramifications of production, sifting for selection, assembling, and the like. There is some doubt that any significant portion of the material produced in the some 300-plus plants around the world would be of permanent collection value. If that is true it might not be commensurate with the expense. In any event, rather than plunge into this added expense without more finite information at hand the committee would prefer to first have the Superintendent continue his exploratory relationships with the agencies so that he can be in a better position to size up the problem and define a budget for it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, with some trepidation I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this for my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED]. He is a diligent worker and he attempts to get all of the answers that are factual and obtainable.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to get the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I hope he will remain, because I believe he can help both the gentleman from Oklahoma and myself, and we may need his help.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman that I was just trying to get another seat where I could devote my entire time to his presentation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this. This is your bill and you can amend it any way you wish.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a lot of items. It carries the east front of the

Capitol Building which was originally planned in 1854 and should have been built when they first estimated for it in 1907, when we could have done it for \$2½ million.

We finally procrastinated and paid somewhere around \$20-some-odd million. It is in the hearings.

This carries the Rayburn Building. I do not think there is anyone here who has been here any length of time but who realizes that whether we like it or not our files are building up and our need for additional office space is evident to me and I think to other members of the Committee.

It carries the underground garages. I will further comment on those in this short prepared speech I have. It carries other items in it that have been carried in the bill mostly by usage through the years. They are subject to amendment by any of you that want to get your names in the paper.

There are the calendars, the wall calendars that cost about 50 cents. We spend about \$27,000 on those a year. They are used to some extent in some of our Civil Service-controlled offices throughout the country where advertising calendars are outlawed by one method or another.

The bill also carries these steamer trunks. We had quite a discussion on that, and an amendment can be offered to knock those out, if you wish. I think you can buy them more cheaply downtown, but they tell me they are well built to rigid specifications. As I have said, this is your bill, brought to the floor under an open rule, and you can work your will upon it.

Our able chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM STEED, and other members of our subcommittee, will do our best to explain the issues involved in any questions you may have. To me, there is something about this bill which I think we should all keep in mind. In a very large sense we are appropriating for the very seat of our Government in this measure.

As I came to work this morning, emerging from one of the truly popular, I think, additions to the Capitol here, that of the garage in the Old House Office Building—I know if nobody else appreciates it, the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, thinks it is the finest invention since the wheel—but as I was coming out of there I met a long queue of high school children. Their eyes were filled with awe and wonder. This Capitol with its dome comes as close to being a symbol of the United States as anything across the country. Here we as the representatives of the people of our country do our work. Here in this Capitol the policies which govern this Nation are debated and enacted. Here, in a broad sense, is the beginning, the amending or the repeal of the various statutes which govern the people of this Nation.

The only symbol of authority, and I would call your attention to it, is the mace right over there. When we sit as the House it is atop the column; when we sit as a Committee, as we do now, it

is beside the column, on the floor of the dais. That is the only symbol of authority in the Nation. It is as absolute as the scepter of a king, if need be; yet it is not downtown in the White House, it is not enshrined in any of the executive departments, it is not kept over here in the Supreme Court Building. It is not even present in the other body when the Senate sits for deliberation. It is here in the House of Representatives.

Do you realize that this body can under certain circumstances elect a President of the United States? Do you know that in this body lies the sole power of impeachment, from which even the President is not excluded?

When I review these things I can better understand why high school children come to this Capitol to see in awe and I hope for inspiration as Americans.

This appropriation is, of course, the housekeeping bill to maintain and improve the environs in which the Capitol operates. I believe it is our duty to keep these premises in repair and, if proper, embellish them. There is shabbiness enough, as it is, and while each of us may have his own opinions, I must remind you that until a very few years ago, this Capitol was bounded on one side by areas that come very close to the slum category. It is no secret that the original plans for the Capitol not only called for the present Mall, but envisaged a similar Mall on the other side of the Capitol. It is well known that our late great Speaker, Sam Rayburn, deplored the area surrounding the Capitol and the legislative offices. He was hopeful that improvement be had. It is because of this, of course, that at long last, agreement was had to acquire the adjoining property and to landscape it properly. It is for this reason that our present parking facilities long in need of being increased, call for the establishment of underground garages, similar to the so-called legislative garage on the Senate side which, as you know, is landscaped entirely on top with a fountain to enhance the beauty of the grounds. And, it is for this reason, that we have acquired this property, and where necessary facilities are to be added, they will be underground with landscaping on top. So much for the Capitol Building.

Part of our surroundings include the greatest library in the world, containing over 40 million pieces of information, volumes, maps, brochures, and pamphlets, originally established to be of use to the Congress and, through the Congress, to all the people of the Nation. We are also appropriating funds for the Library of Congress in this bill today.

Also, I would like to call to your attention the testimony of our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGLER, which appears on page 360 of the printed hearings. I think you will find that it enlarges in a very interesting way on the original planner's intentions and the growth that have resulted in our present activities to improve our area on Capitol Hill.

As a proud Member of this House of Representatives, I have tried through the years to understand the whyfords of some of our facilities. I think you will find an

interesting statement on page 334 of the hearings which deals with the work of the attending physician.

Certainly the cross-currents, the pressures, the burdens, the conflicts, the frustrations and the demands of those of us who sit in the House can and does have an effect on our health. It may be true that we are no different than other people who live in the turmoils of this fast-moving age. But here at the Capitol, it was not always easy to get a doctor in emergency time. You will note that Dr. Calver estimates that once it took from 1 to 3 hours for a physician to administer to a legislator with heart trouble or other ailments. Moreover, when one adds to this the serious attacks that might befall all those who work on the Hill and when one realizes that thousands of people pour through the corridors each day, certainly all of us are agreed that the attending physician's office is more than justified. There is no doubt in my mind that many lives have been saved and extended. We call your attention to the records on page 336 of these hearings to show you that the work achieved by this important office is considerable, and I might add that I have learned that some of these figures are not complete.

So we bring this bill to you and, again, I must remind you that it is your bill, that there is an open rule and that any of you may offer any amendments which you feel are justified.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on what I think is a very excellent job in handling this very difficult bill. I think, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, if he could satisfy half of the people he would be doing an excellent job, because most of us will have the opportunity or the inclination to want to criticize some specific thing which is contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the finest services that the committee has rendered this time has been in the suggestion made in its report. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] commented on the wall calendar item, which is a small item. It involves only 27,000-and-some-odd dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment to strike that item out of the bill, not particularly to save the \$27,000, but to try to put this House on record as doing something affirmatively and positively to which Congress can point and say "Yes; we are willing to make some reduction and some savings." I think we need to take that into account.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has also, of course, mentioned the fact that some money could be saved by reverting to the practice of a few years ago when these so-called packing boxes or trunks were furnished only to Members who requested them. I think that was a fine suggestion. I do not intend to offer an amendment, but I hope the Clerk will take that into account.

Mr. Chairman, one of the other things which I want to mention here is the great

cost and the growing increase in the cost of operating the Government Printing Office, because of the great amount of printing that is being done on behalf of the House of Representatives. As I pointed out earlier in the day, it is my opinion that through the adoption of a very simple limitation on some of the things that appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or some limitation on what could go in the RECORD, or the amount that could be utilized by the individual Members, we could save \$1 million in that one item alone.

We know throughout our hearings on our committees that these hearings are growing all the time. There is also an inclination—and I think it is a growing one—as we have witnesses appear before our various committees and subcommittees, someone will ask unanimous consent for certain things to appear in the printed hearings, without giving any attention to whether that represents a duplication of material which has been printed by some other Government agency and which is available just upon request from the agency.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a rather detailed study of the printing of the House of Representatives for the last several years. Having grown up in a country printing office and being somewhat familiar with the cost of printing, I think I can detect the opportunity for some savings which will not do damage and which will not take away any of the information that the House and the individual Members need. But if the Members will read here on page 23 of the report they will note that the Public Printer has asked for \$11 million to beef up the liquidity of the revolving fund out of which the Printing Office operates. The sum of \$6,750,000 was identified with increased business volume.

In other words, I would ask seriously that before Members request to have their extensions printed and include extraneous and many times irrelevant material they should consider is this material or is this information available elsewhere—readily available—and that we can get it without cluttering up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in our hearings the committees too often include in such hearings a duplication of printing which could be avoided and which could save hundreds of thousands of dollars each year.

I hate to stand up here and say I am going to be the guardian of this House. I am not. What I am doing today is to try to point up the importance of this matter. I am hoping we can at some time, maybe not have inflexible rules or very strict rules, but at least have some understanding among the Members of the House as to what is relevant and what should be included in the printing not only of the RECORD but of the reports and other things printed for the use of the House.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I have served on the Printing Committee with the gentleman from

Missouri, and on behalf of the gentleman, and in designation of his good faith in this matter, I should like to point out that for the last 3 years the gentleman from Missouri has tried in every conceivable way to get enough interest in the printing of the RECORD, and other matters, to establish proper policies and procedures. If the gentleman has done nothing else but call attention to the fact that we have a very serious situation, he has performed a most noteworthy service to the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to renew my request for other Members to join me in trying to save some money.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in 1950, a contract in the amount of \$10,563,000 was awarded the construction firm of McCloskey & Co., for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston, Mass.

Scarcely had the hospital been completed and occupied in 1953 when the Veterans' Administration notified the Army Corps of Engineers that there were serious defects in the construction; that serious damage had already occurred and would get progressively worse unless extensive repairs and corrections were made.

Subsequently, the Corps of Engineers estimated the repairs and corrections would cost \$4 million.

On January 3, 1963, I wrote to Attorney General Robert Kennedy stating that faulty construction of such magnitude was an outrage and asserted it would be an even greater outrage to use public funds to correct such defects without action being initiated by the Federal Government to hold to account those responsible for such shoddy construction and recover the funds thus expended.

On January 22, 1963, I received a letter from Acting Assistant Attorney General Joseph D. Guilfoyle stating that the Attorney General's Office was then carrying on conferences with attorneys, engineers, and architects of the Veterans' Administration and the Corps of Engineers to ascertain legal responsibility for this outrageously defective hospital construction.

Assistant Attorney General Guilfoyle informed me that once the full facts could be developed as to liability and damage, the Attorney General's Office would communicate with me.

Remember, this letter was written on January 22, 1963, and Mr. Guilfoyle said then it was expected the full facts would be developed in March of 1963.

It is now near the middle of June, March has long since passed into history, and I have heard absolutely nothing from the Attorney General's Office. Perhaps the Attorney General and his lieutenants have been too busy devising ways and means of stirring up other trouble and

spending the taxpayers money to hold to account those who may have brought about the waste of \$4 million.

And Ambassador McCloskey, the former finance chairman of the Democrat National Committee, is probably too busy carrying on his arduous diplomatic duties in Ireland to pay much heed either to the proper construction of a hospital for war veterans or completion of the "100-year pyramid"—otherwise known as the New House Office Building. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the contract for construction of the New House Office Building was awarded to McCloskey & Co., long after the shoddy, defective construction of the Boston veterans hospital had become apparent.

Mr. Chairman, I am again writing the Attorney General in an effort to ascertain whether McCloskey & Co., or anyone else is going to be held to account.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], in hoping to live long enough to see that new, New House Office Building completed. For altogether too long streets have been blockaded and traffic has been diverted all over the place. Many of the Members of the House have to drive blocks out of their way in order to get to work in the morning or to their homes in the evening. The time it has taken to build that 100-year pyramid is unconscionable. And, I am surprised that the members of the Building Committee have done nothing to expedite the procedure. With the gentleman from Ohio, I cannot help but suspect that workmen have been pulled off that job in order to take on lucrative contracts elsewhere; in other words, the taxpayers of the country footing the bills and the Congress being made to pay the penalty for this monstrous construction schedule.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. The gentleman from Iowa has banded the name of McCloskey around here. I agree with everything you have said with respect to the Ambassador to Ireland, but just so we keep the record straight, I am not related to Mr. McCloskey. I spell my name differently, and I happen to come from the poor side of the family, the one who is interested in saving the taxpayers some money.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for keeping the record straight and assure him that I could not possibly confuse him with this former keeper of the purse for the Democrat Party.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to understand how the contract for this plush House Office Building could have been awarded by the Building Commission of the House of Representatives to a contractor who was under the cloud that McCloskey apparently was in Boston, Mass., with respect to the veterans hospital there. And, I am going to watch, as I am sure others will, how this congressional business turns out across the street.

I should like to say, too, that before the day is over I intend to offer an amendment to stop any further spend-

ing of funds for the swimming pool and to stop any spending of funds to cut new doors in the Members' offices. My understanding, according to page 206 of the hearing record, is that the doors that would be put in would only be perhaps 2 feet wide, and if I have not been deceived, there are some Members of the House that would have a hard time getting through a 2-foot door.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. With reference to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that he proposed to offer an amendment denying funds for the construction of a certain 2-foot door in the individual Member's office, it was never designed to be there in the first place. The matter has been before the Commission, and the Commission concluded that for the time being there will be no such door cut. Now, I personally do not think any such door is needed, and I find myself in complete agreement in not appropriating any money for cutting the doors through. Of course, you must recognize this fact, that whenever anyone constructs a building such as this, other people may have and often do have different views as to how it should be constructed. For instance, there were a great many suggestions being made with reference to this or that characteristic, about the number of suites, and so forth. You cannot find everybody in accord. It was designed after the plans had been submitted to the Commission, of which Speaker Rayburn was Chairman, and they tried to make it a most workable place for the Members and their staff, and the committees, I thought then, and I think now, that each suite is so designed for efficiency, for accommodation, and for everything that a Member needs to enable him to properly discharge his duty as a Member of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the support of the gentleman from Georgia for my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. May I say this: I do not think the gentleman should be disturbed about it. I am hoping, in view of such a splendid bill that has been brought here before this Committee, the gentleman does not offer an amendment. I have spent considerable time reading the record on this bill and I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Washington, and the other members of the subcommittee in bringing in such a fine bill as this. I hope the gentleman from Iowa does not offer an amendment. Do not worry about that door. I hope that the gentleman will have a suite in the building and I think he will be satisfied with it.

Mr. GROSS. But I do worry about it, I say to the gentleman because there are so many pure minds around here that are kept pure because they change so often.

Mr. VINSON. I think if the gentleman would stop that argument I would find myself in accord with him, but you need not worry about the doors.

Mr. GROSS. All I wish to do now is thank the gentleman for his support for

my amendment. I only hope he does not change his mind when a vote comes on the amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say will probably fall on deaf ears in this Chamber today. The great cry of the American people today is for economy in Government. This is also the cry of many Members of this body. The free spenders should have no trouble today but those, on both sides of the aisle, who espouse economy in Government should do a good deal of soul searching today before voting "aye" on this legislation. The question is—will we today be hypocrites—will we use two standards: one for us and one for the rest?

Some 169 Members of this body will soon be housed in the most expensive office building ever erected on earth. As pointed out in a most revealing article in my hometown newspaper, the Louisville Times, the "squat and unappealing new office building will cost the taxpayers \$131,500,000," including land, construction, subway, engineering fees, and so forth. It took quite a bit of checking yesterday before I was able to determine that included in the \$20 million today requested for this building is an undisclosed amount for the swimming pool. It is hard enough for me to be on the floor as much as I should with the volume of work in my office resulting primarily from the intervention of the Federal Government into the daily lives of all of the people with its many bureaus and departments. I, personally, have no time for such luxuries and I am confident that those who would take the time would do so at the expense of the work of their respective offices. The question is quite frankly—will we spend our time frolicking in the pool, built with taxpayers' money, while on the taxpayers' payroll? Some of us are concerned about what we often refer to as creeping socialism. Will we today be a party to socialized swimming? Most of the damage has already been done in regard to that monstrosity, but we need not compound the felony today.

While I am on this subject, I might add that I, for one, feel that we should change the sign on the dining room to "Members Socialized Dining Room." It seems a subsidy of \$250,000 is needed to make the operations of the various dining rooms break even.

Under this appropriation bill, we will completely furnish the Rayburn Building with new furniture. My question is quite frankly, "Do we have 169 Members with discardable furniture?" I suppose it depends on the station in life to which you are accustomed. There is no numerical increase in Members' staffs—no more desks or desk chairs will be needed. The things that are worn out, we should replace—what extra furniture is needed to accommodate the space, we should, within reason, attempt to furnish. From my own limited experience, I could use any expanded space just for the staff to have "elbowroom." My thinking is that we could well do with a small portion of the \$3,500,000 provided for this purpose.

I think it is interesting to note that a figure equal to 5 percent of the structure cost of \$71,500,000, or \$3,500,000, is needed for "Administration and miscellaneous" on the Rayburn Building. How much of this that has already been appropriated and how much of it that is included in today's bill, I do not know.

We are asked to include \$4.625 million toward a total of \$8 million for underground garages south of the office buildings—which will be covered with open, sodded parklike areas. This, I am sure, will be attractive and wonderful—but can the taxpayers afford it? Parking space is needed—but for \$8 million you can build a lot of building on top of the ground. Not as pretty, I will grant you—but the already overpicked pockets of our taxpayers somewhat overshadows "esthetic view," in my book.

Today represents a real opportunity for self-discipline. Those who would do away with socialized swimming, socialized meals, socialized flowers, socialized haircuts, and many unnecessary expenses too numerous to mention can do it today. The areas for correction in this bill appear to me to be too numerous for a proper job to be done by amendments. Today we can reject the bill and by that action, the committee and the taxpayers will know we mean business and a bill can be reported that evidences that we in Congress are operating on a sensible budget.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it could be said that this is probably as important an appropriation bill as will come before this House as there will be during this year or any other year. This, I think, comes about primarily because it involves two very significant purposes. No. 1, it involves the operation of the Congress itself. Second, it involves to a far larger degree than many of us realize, a service to the public. In light of that I should say, and I say it with great sincerity, that I appreciate the work that has been done in behalf of this bill on the part of the chairman, the ranking member, and each of the other members.

As a new member of the committee let me say to this House that this is a real experience. And I should be bold enough to insinuate that it might be good for every Member of this House to serve at least once on this committee. I am sure it would alert him to a number of items that probably previously had not come to his attention.

Why do I place that emphasis on this bill? I do it for this reason: because, as has already been pointed out, there ought to be funds provided which would permit this House and the Congress to function in response to the problems that come before it in a most effective manner.

By the same token it also behooves every Member of this House to see that those expenditures in turn are used with prudence and with frugality so that they are productive to the greatest possible degree of every dollar expended. This is a matter that certainly is important to every Member of the House.

The unique part of it, and I have heard some criticism here today which no doubt is good, is that I do not recall a single critic coming to the committee during the time of the hearings. As a matter of fact, all during this time I recall only one person who called to make an inquiry about all the moneys that are in this bill. But be that as it may, the moneys that are here have been as carefully pruned as could be by the committee under existing authority, remembering again that there is a major portion of these funds with which the committee could do nothing because the authorizations have previously been enacted which provides these moneys for each individual congressional office, and if it is their desire to expend them, then sufficient moneys must be provided. If they are not here, they will show up again in the deficiency bill or somewhere else. So to that need, again we must be responsive.

By the same token, there are moneys in here that provide a substantial service to the public, even to the matter of parking cars when they come here to visit. Yes, they extend all the way to providing services to the blind people. The wealth of material that is supplied through the Library of Congress or through other Government documents that are pertinent in supplying information to the public in relation to their Government, becomes a public service, if you please. By the same token, this is a necessary service. Again, we should encourage that every prudence be used in their expenditure, but by the same token let us not forget that a democracy will never be any stronger than the extent to which you have an informed populace. Anything we might do to encourage that information if properly used and properly expended is a contribution to the degree in which this Government may function both efficiently and effectively.

So as we look at the problems that may confront us in the area of these expenditures, I would then suggest that we look a little further into the future and as we deal with the legislative matters that provide for these expenditures, that we rather raise the objections when the authorizations are granted, because once those authorities are granted it becomes almost mandatory upon the Appropriations Committee to supply the money.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that there were a good many items in here that I as an individual felt ought to be reduced substantially and could be reduced substantially, but because of the existing authorizations it was mandatory to provide the moneys needed. I realize that in the light of that there are a good many different views on the part of the respective Members, and having so expressed myself, that there would be many others who would object on the same basis.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. If the Congress and the gentleman had known in the original

resolution, if there had been a price tag put on this, you would not have had this situation, would you?

Mr. LANGEN. I am sure this is quite true, because a good many of the decisions here have been projected into the future without knowing what the future held, and we are now being faced with the facts of life.

Mr. HALEY. It is just the result of these open-end authorizations. Members of the Congress never know and the people downtown in other parts of the Government do not want you to know.

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad that I have received an additional minute to comment on the excellent observation made by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida. He and I have worked together on the Interior Committee and have had a good many discussions on the matter of open-end appropriations. Of course, here we have been exposed to the full impact of that kind of appropriation and we have seen the folly of leaving an open end which provides the opportunity, as the gentleman has said, for unwarranted expenditures that are not responsive to the original intent of the Congress. So I would recommend that a proper consideration be given to any appropriation bill that is before us in this respect.

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

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

Mr. STINSON. I have asked the gentleman to yield briefly just to make a quick observation. The total cost of the square footage in the Rayburn Building, that is, for usable square footage, ought to be cleared up. It seems there are only 935,069 square feet of usable space. If we divide this into \$71,500,000, this brings us a figure of approximately \$76 per square foot for the usable space in the building. I think that, perhaps, is the figure that the American taxpayers should have instead of the \$30 per square foot figure. Much of that building is not usable space and, evidently, is being taken up for parking, garages, and other areas. So I think the taxpayers should have an idea of just exactly what that square footage of office space is going to cost them.

Mr. LANGEN. If I may respond to the gentleman for the worthy observations he has just made, here again let me just suggest a little precaution be used because when it comes to a matter of figures and statistics and talking about the square feet and making comparisons, we need to make sure that all of these comparisons are made on the same basis. I think I raised some of the identical questions as the gentleman just raised, to make sure that if we are comparing the cost of this building with another building, that we are making the same kind of square foot comparison. I had some experience with this in the State legislature at a time when some State buildings were being constructed. The experience there was much the same because of the degree to which we might have evaluated the usable space or the nonusable space, and the gross number of square feet as compared to the net

number of square feet. The same thing applies to the cubic feet. But, in that light and being at the point that we now are that if any changes should be made, they should have been made a long time ago and it is too late to do it now after the building is up.

Mr. STINSON. I quite agree with the gentleman. Of course, I was not a Member of the Congress when the idea of this building was conceived. I quite agree with the gentleman, however, that we should use the same measuring stick. But in your experience, do you think it is normal for a building to have a gross of 2,375,000 square feet of space and to have usable space of only 935,000 square feet?

Mr. LANGEN. I would say to the gentleman, I was not here either when the building was started and with regard to the question the gentleman raises, I would suggest that he refer it to the architect who would be in a position to provide him with the answer that he seeks.

Mr. STINSON. I thank my colleague. Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

RUSSIANS INCREASE SHIPS TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have received information from various U.S. Government sources which shows that the Russians have increased the number of ships supplying Castro's island in recent weeks.

It may be too early to determine the significance of this increase, but stepped up shipping was an early sign of the Soviet military buildup of Cuba last summer. I strongly urge that U.S. surveillance of Cuba be intensified to insure that our intelligence community can provide reliable and accurate data for U.S. policymakers.

During the month of May, 37 Soviet ships, along with 9 Soviet-bloc ships, called in Cuba. April shipping figures show 27 Soviet vessels, along with 7 Soviet-bloc ships. Total Iron Curtain shipping to Cuba for the first 6 months of 1963 numbers 165 ships, 52 of which were tankers.

Detailed Russian shipping figures for 1963 are as follows:

Month	Total	Soviet-flag ships	Bloc-flag ships	Tankers
January.....	41	35	6	10
February.....	38	34	4	10
March.....	35	32	3	10
April.....	34	27	7	10
May.....	46	37	9	12
To date.....	194	165	29	52

However, the shocking fact is that one out of every three ships supplying Castro's island is from the free world.

Since January 1963, 89 allied ships have made trips to Cuba, and 20 of these vessels were tankers. This shipping would have been considerably reduced if the U.S. Government had implemented my proposal to close U.S. ports to nations which allow their flags to be used in sea trade with Cuba. However, such action is warranted particularly now in view of this new development.

The British are the main offenders. Since January of this year there have been 33 British ships which have called in Cuba. The British would think twice about shipping to Castro if we banned the *Queen Mary* from New York Harbor.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. STEED. Yes, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, last year we passed an amendment relative to patron mail. Now a question has been raised in connection with this legislation, and I see it is referred to on, I believe, page 347 of the subcommittee hearings. The question has been raised as to whether or not we are reinstituting this patron mail as occupant mail and as junk mail by frank in this legislation.

I would like to have that clarified if I could.

Mr. STEED. My understanding of it is that the amendment last year applied to the fiscal 1963 bill only. There is no mention of it in the bill this year and so far as I know that puts the matter back under the previous law which has been in existence all the time which does permit the Postmaster General to make such mail possible if he wants to. It is discretionary with the Postmaster General and whether he will permit it or not I do not know. They did permit it under the old law, that is, prior to last October when the restriction was written into the fiscal 1963 law. What the Postmaster General will do, if the bill passes in this form, the gentleman's guess is as good as mine.

Mr. DEVINE. If the gentleman will yield further, then if we vote for this bill as it now stands, without further amendment, it is the understanding of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the patron mail or so-called junk mail by frank will be reinstituted, or that this operates as a repeal of the amendment?

Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is that the use of the frank will go back under the previous law enacted by Congress under which we have been operating all these years, and under that law the Postmaster General has the discretion to permit it or deny it. I have no way of knowing what this Postmaster General or the next one may do under it.

Mr. DEVINE. This is very revealing. I thank the gentleman for his frankness.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better complete the record on this matter insofar as the present bill is concerned by inserting the statement from the committee report of June 6—last week. It gives the situation.

FRANKED MAILINGS

The bill includes the amended budget amount of \$4,867,374, an increase of \$881,374 over the fiscal 1963 appropriation. The figure was supplied by the Post Office Department from data obtained under its cost ascertainment procedure. The amount represents fiscal 1962 mailings since this item is funded on a delayed basis. The cost ascertainment procedure is a statistical calculation using mail volume sampling techniques.

The money has already been spent by the Department in handling the mail and this appropriation does little more than serve to distribute the cost to the legislative bill; the other appropriation bills do a similar thing for mailings by other agencies of Government. Volume is one factor in the determination. Cost is the other.

The Department advises that the figure of \$4,867,374 represents 110,944,016 pieces of franked mail during fiscal 1962. The increase in cost—\$881,374—over the preceding year is stated to be primarily attributable to volume. The fiscal 1963 appropriation of \$3,986,000, for fiscal 1961 mailings, was based on 88,821,000 pieces. Going back another year, the 1962 appropriation of \$3,836,000, again according to the Department, covered 113,026,744 pieces mailed during fiscal 1960. Last year the committee was advised that the increase from \$3,836,000, representing 1960 mailings, to \$3,986,000, representing 1961 mailings, was occasioned by postal salary increases under Public Law 86—568 effective with the beginning of fiscal 1961. While that might have been the net result and explanation, there necessarily had to be some partially offsetting reduction from the fact that the volume of mailings as reported by the Department dropped from 113 million plus in fiscal 1960 to 88 million plus in fiscal 1961. In the absence of any unusual cost factors obtaining during fiscal 1962, it seems reasonable that if the volume reached 110 million plus in 1962 as reported, then the request of \$4,867,374 would not appear out of line.

But these figures clearly seem to point up another fact. It is that there is no showing that the availability or use of the simplified address procedure for franked mailings during that part of fiscal 1962 from October of 1961 to June of 1962 had any significant influence, if indeed any at all, on the volume of mail. As noted, the volume in fiscal 1960—when the simplified address procedure was not in effect—exceeded the reported volume for fiscal 1962 when the procedure was in effect for approximately 8 of the 12 months. And as far as costs are concerned, the Department's statement that the per-piece cost of handling franked mail with a simplified form of address is less than the same mail fully addressed has never been challenged.

Considerations of economy—and that extends not only to the handling by the Department but to the addressing in Members' offices—plus the added consideration that under the present prohibition we have the absurd situation whereby Members of Congress using the frank do not even have privileges on a parity with private mailers on either rural, star, or city routes or boxes suggest to a majority of the committee the commonsense of discontinuing the restriction. Private mailers can send rural mail addressed simply "Postal patron, local" and city mail without a specific name. Under the present restriction Members of Congress using the frank can do neither—an absurdity on its face. The simplified addressing procedure obtaining prior to last October was entirely permissive and would remain so under the accompanying bill. Members of Congress could continue to use the more complete address if they so prefer. The choice would be solely theirs.

The language included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, providing

that funds available for reimbursing the Post Office for the cost of congressional mailings should also be available for the expenses, as authorized by existing law, of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under the congressional frank was not repeated in the 1963 bill because it was permanent law. Repetition was unnecessary. This provision was temporarily set aside by an amendment in the form of a limitation on the use of funds inserted by the Senate and subsequently agreed to by the House in the 1963 bill, but it only attached to the money in the bill and therefore expires June 30, 1963. The restriction—section 105 of the 1963 law—is not repeated in the accompanying bill. The permanent law would again become controlling.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE
FURNITURE

For furniture and materials for repairs of the same, including labor, tools, and machinery for furniture repair shops, and for the purchase of packing boxes, \$269,620.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: After line 12 on page 5, add the following section and renumber following lines accordingly:

"Provided however, That no funds appropriated for the Office of the Chaplain, Office of the Clerk, Committee Employees, Office of the Sergeant at Arms, Office of the Doorkeeper, Special and Minority Employees, Office of the Postmaster, Official Reporters of Debates, Official Reporters to Committees, the Committee on Appropriations, Office of the Legislative Council, or Members Clerk Hire, shall be used to pay salaries or other such remuneration to any person who is a relative by blood or marriage of any incumbent Member of the House of Representatives."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have frequently engaged in worrisome studies designed to determine what foreigners think of the United States. In fact, construction of a favorable international image is a compelling passion with many stalwart souls. And maybe this is a good thing.

However, it is this Member's opinion that we might be better concerned in this body with what the American citizen thinks of the U.S. Congress. This is not an academic matter. I hold that the House of Representatives is the most democratic legislative body in the world. It is the bulwark of our entire system of representative government. If the people cannot have faith in this institution, their faith in our very foundations is shattered.

It is natural that the House of Representatives should be the subject of much discussion, and in the nature of things, even the object of both humor and criticism. This House is much better than certain reporters and newswriters would picture it. There are, after all, some members of that most worthy profession, who prefer sensational reporting of distorted bits to presentation of honest details and opinions. Without training which could

lead to perception, but with practice in touring the sewers in glass-bottom boats, their efforts cannot be considered constructive.

Nor is the House as "sea green incorruptible" or efficient as painted by one of the complacent Congressmen spooning bean soup in the company of his mutual admiration society.

The truth is somewhere in between. The fact remains that there are enough unjustifiable policies, and there are enough individuals doing enough which is subject to criticism to cast a shadow of malfeasance or inefficiency on the entire body of good, devoted men and women. When all the smoke and fury over reform has cleared, I personally do not think there is anything fundamentally wrong with the Congress which a little introspection and a 6-day week would not cure. The Congress must not only refrain from doing wrong, but it must refrain from those unnecessary practices which give the impression of wrongdoing.

High on this category is the matter loosely termed "nepotism." All of us recognize that there are relatives on payrolls who perform their jobs honestly and competently. There is no aspersion in these remarks against any individual or any employee. But the practice is unnecessary. Bad situations have developed because of nepotism and they will continue to happen. While certain areas of the Nation might be tolerant to specific cases, the citizens of the Nation generally object to nepotism.

This amendment simply makes it impossible for nepotism to exist in the House of Representatives in those categories covered by this part of the bill. Another amendment will be offered later today covering the joint committees of the two Houses. Once we have eliminated the practice in the legislative branch, we can in good conscience eliminate it in the executive and judicial branches.

The amendment is offered in good faith for your serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Oklahoma withdrawing his point of order?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order and rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the contention of this amendment. I am proud to say that in all my years here I have never practiced what this amendment would prohibit. I am also proud to say that every member of the delegation from Oklahoma can make the same statement as to his own situation.

This is a matter that has caused the Congress some criticism and some embarrassment over many years. It is nothing new. The only reason I oppose the application here is because it is impractical and unwise to try to accomplish this sort of thing in an appropriation bill here on the floor.

We have a House Administration Committee. This is a matter I would suppose to be within their jurisdiction. We have tried to avoid the criticism that has been sometimes justly directed at us in years gone by. We have tried not to usurp or

encroach upon other committees. We try to carry out the mandates of the House. I hope the membership, regardless of how they may feel about the merits of this idea, will not impose it on this bill, but if they are that interested in cleaning up this matter, to take it before the proper committee and, having done so, if they can get any type of resolution reported that will change the situation, under those circumstances, it will have my help and support. I just hope we do not make it a practice of trying to correct all of these important policy matters we are criticized about in this bill when we have a more logical and more effective way of doing these things, if we have that much interest in them. This is a policy matter. It ought to come before us in a policy bill, not on this bill. It needs careful committee consideration. I hope the Members will defeat the amendment, and I hope that those who think that it does have merit will take whatever steps can be taken to have it otherwise properly brought before the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask my colleague from Iowa a question or two concerning his amendment. Do I understand that this is purely and simply an antinepotism amendment?

Mr. KYL. That is clear.

Mr. GROSS. It goes no further than to raise the prohibition against nepotism?

Mr. KYL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see how anyone could possibly be opposed to this amendment.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I do not know how or where you are going to find out who is practicing nepotism. If what we read in the papers is true, some is going on, and under those circumstances it is going to be quite difficult to apply the mandate of this amendment if it is approved. I do not know whether it will do what shall be done or not. It seems to me that if there are so many Members here that are so interested, why do they not go to the right committee and bring these things out in a proper legislative order. Why try to apply it when an appropriation is in here every time.

Mr. GROSS. Just 1 minute. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that this is not the only provision of that nature. There are a number of provisions in this bill that have not gone to the proper committees, and the gentleman well knows it. That argument falls of its own weight, coming from the chairman of the subcommittee, who has written legislation, deliberately written legislative proposals in this bill. Let us not hear any more about that because you have not gone to the proper committee in a number of other instances.

Mr. STEED. We have always tried to keep matters of policy before the proper committees.

Mr. GROSS. Do not let us have any more argument of that kind, because the

bill contains other policy and legislative proposals.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not intend to say anything here, but in view of the question raised, I must say I am the only Member that has an antinepotism bill in, and I have not yet been able to get a hearing on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the gentleman has introduced a bill, and I would be most happy to support his bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And I have asked almost every month for a hearing on this bill, and I have not gotten it yet.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say to the gentleman I have no relatives, even down to the 69th cousin, on my payroll or any payroll of the House, but if this is such a good amendment, why do you not come in with a bill prohibiting it all over the country? I read an article in *Forbes* magazine, regarding one of the big industries in Ohio, that said that one of the reasons it was in such bad shape, that they had the nepotism practice there that if similar nepotism were practiced in Congress, it would cause a scream to go up from coast to coast.

Who are these holier-than-thou people always criticizing Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman, and the gentleman well knows, that an all-inclusive amendment to this bill would go out on a point of order. The gentleman is well aware of that. It is impossible to cover the executive branch of Government in this appropriation bill. The amendment must be limited to the funds contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY, CONSTRUCTION, AND EQUIPMENT, ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the acquisition of property, construction, and equipment of an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, and other changes and improvements, authorized by the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 41, 42), \$20,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 17, line 17, after the figure "\$20,000,000," strike the period, insert a colon, and insert the following: "Provided, That none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used for the construction of a swimming pool, and: *Provided further*, That none of

the funds made available in this Act shall be used for the installation of additional doors in the Members' offices in the additional House Office Building."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with a Federal debt of \$306 billion on the books, and a deficit ranging anywhere from \$7 to \$12 billion or more, I insist Members of the House can dispense with a swimming pool in the New-New House Office Building. As a matter of fact, they tell me—I have not seen it—that there is an excellent pool across the way operated by the other body. I see no reason why the Members could not tuck their swimming trunks or their bikinis, or whatever they are, under their arm and go over there, if they must swim, until we can get a balanced budget and get this country back on the track financially. They can do their swimming over there. Is that not logical?

I am sure Members of the Senate would not discriminate against Members of the House. I am sure that is an integrated pool; it is bound to be. So why not dispense with a swimming pool in the New-New House Office Building? And anyway, it is one of the last things to be installed in the new. There are no firm plans even now. I doubt that some of you will get to use it anyway, because it is probably 5 or 10 years away at the rate the building is being constructed.

So I hope you will join with me in providing no funds for a plush swimming pool.

The other part of the amendment simply stops the business of cutting additional doors in the Members' offices in the New-New House Office Building. It is my understanding, as previously stated on the House floor, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], a member of the building committee, concurred at that time, and I hope to have his support now. I hope he has not walked through another rose garden and changed his mind.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does not the gentleman realize that there is a rule in the other body that nobody except a Member of that body is privileged to use their pool?

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised there is that kind of discrimination practiced.

Mr. YOUNGER. There is. That is a segregated pool.

Mr. GROSS. Well, let us see if we cannot do something about that. Let us see if Mr. Kennedy, or one of the Kennedys, I do not care which one, but one of them, can get something done about that.

Mr. Chairman, going back to this matter of cutting new doors in this building, I understand this could cost another \$160,000, and that the doors might be only 2 feet in width. As I said before, there are some Members who would have difficulty getting through a 2-foot-wide door in order to avoid their constituents.

So, let us save doors and money. I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. I see no reason why members cannot walk through their reception rooms to get to their employees

or press a button and have their employees come through the reception room to get to them.

We do not need to spend \$160,000 or more of the taxpayer's money for another door for each of 169 Members. Let us write my restriction into the bill, just in case somebody does walk through a rose garden and have his mind changed for him.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, this I think indicates that when a Member has the responsibility of handling a bill like this, he can often find himself in a very peculiar position in trying to defend the bill. I am not for wasting money, and I rise in opposition to this amendment for the reason that I think a gymnasium and swimming pool of the types contemplated here, added to this project at the recommendation and with the hearty support of those who are charged with looking after the good health of the Members, is a good thing and needed. I hope that we defeat this amendment and permit these health facilities to be made available to Members of Congress who need exercise and who apparently all too often neglect themselves by not taking it. We might even get my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, to go down there and take some exercise and keep his health as good as it is now, and make it possible for him to serve here for many, many more wonderful and effective years if we had something like this to offer him.

As to the matter of the doors, I am not completely sure that anyone at this point can say what this amendment will do. Some of the doors under the original plan are not yet built. They have some rooms as yet not constructed. I do not know whether this will confuse the situation or not. I think that we might be doing more to the doors than we think we are if we adopt this amendment. In any event, the matter has been exaggerated in the press. I realize it is easy for an unkind press, and that is what the Congress has to live with, to make a great mountain out of this molehill, but I think there comes a time when we ought to be willing to do those things that are desirable.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HORAN. We went into this and we had frank discussions in our committee. I say to the Committee here and now that I concur with the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. STEED]. I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. STEED. I ask the Committee to vote down the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I would like to make it plain, too, with some reluctance, that I disagree with my friend from Iowa. I happen to think as one of those who uses the gym as frequently as I can that if more Members would go down there and let off steam we would be a lot happier and more productive on the floor. Furthermore I am not only for swimming pools, I would like to report, too, and I

think I can do this in accuracy, that Dr. Calver has made it plain to me, and I hope and expect to our beloved Speaker, about the necessity for keeping the present facilities in addition to the new facilities in the New House Office Building, so we may have additional facilities for those who choose to go there in the future, whether handicapped or not. I do not think going to the gym is just for the handicapped. I know that if I did not go there I would probably be worse to get along with than I am, and possibly that might apply to others.

Mr. STEED. The Congress has approved a lot of other types of exercise. There are some of us here who are getting up in years, to the point where that may be desirable. Daily exercise for short periods is widely recommended and we ought to avail ourselves of it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, particularly that portion of it relating to swimming pools. As one who has been interested in swimming for many years, I have always rather resented the fact that the only kind of exercise we have available to us here in the House is paddle ball. Paddle ball is a fine sport and I know many of my friends have followed it. But, as I am sure the attending physician will attest, swimming is recognized as the best sport of all. We here are all interested in physical fitness. We have a physician to watch over our health. I think a swimming pool would be a great addition to our congressional physical fitness program. Yes, swimming is a great sport. And I might say it is a little less dangerous than bicycling, which I ran afoul of just yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 26, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: Page 17, preceding the section of the bill titled Capitol Power Plant, add the following new language: "Provided, however, That no funds appropriated by this bill shall be used to construct underground parking facilities in the two squares immediately south of the Longworth and Rayburn Buildings, or to pay for planning and design not already completed."

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, today we have had some discussion about the desirability of letting the House know what is in these appropriation measures. I want to say I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has done an excellent job in dispelling many of these clouds.

I would like to call attention to what we are doing in regard to providing underground parking space in these lots south of the new Rayburn Office Building and the Longworth Building. We are proposing to spend \$8 million to provide 720 parking spaces in addition to what we have. Bear in mind, there are

now parking lots above ground in this area. This parking will be removed if this underground facility is constructed. We will have underground facilities providing an additional 720 spaces. If we figure the cost on that basis, each one of these parking spaces will cost around \$11,000 unless we include the cost of the land involved.

Now I cannot estimate exactly what this land is worth, but with the dimensions in mind and comparing it with other land that has been purchased in the Capitol Hill area in recent years, it is logical to assume that we will also use about \$2 million worth of land for the construction of these garages. If we were building a building on this lot, and we are still talking about annexes for the Library Building and for other facilities here, if we were building a building on this spot and thus making better and wiser use of it, we would not be precluded from building underground parking beneath that building, the same way we are doing with the Rayburn Building. We could still get the parking and use the land with much more benefit. But if we build these parking garages in the two squares or lots, then we will again be faced with the prospect when the need for a new building in the neighborhood of the Capitol arises, we will be faced with the prospect of buying additional land which is now in private hands, and taking more of that property which belongs on the tax rolls of the District of Columbia, and moving people who should not be disturbed. We would be faced with the prospect of finding additional space to build the building that we did not put on top of the ground south of the Rayburn Building. I think the House should be aware of the action we are taking. Certainly, we need parking facilities on the Hill. There is not any question about that. But with the numbers of tourists who visit here, it is unlikely that we will ever catch up with the demand. When you leave the House today, if you will tour the existing facilities, you will find on good days and in good weather, these underground areas are not even used because they are not as handy as the spaces available along the curb. So, in effect, you would not be getting an actual 720 car increase in parking spaces even if we do construct this garage. I do not think there is wisdom in this proposal. I do not think we can justify this kind of expenditure at this time.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have here provided the first year's cost for a project designed on the two squares south of the Longworth Building and the Rayburn Building for the construction of underground garages to provide parking facilities for 1,220 cars, and in addition the construction of some urgently needed facilities to house the carpenter shop and the furniture repair shop and the electrical shop and the paint shop and other service facilities now housed throughout the House Office Building and Capitol Building that are using up space that is needed for other purposes and that are creating noise and may in some instances be

termed a nuisance and also in some instances a fire hazard.

Of this estimated \$8 million cost that would go into this underground facility, roughly \$1 million will be used at the corner where the old George Washington Inn is now situated in order to place these service and shops there. We cannot ever eliminate the eyesore of parking lots now in existence until such a project of this kind is built, because we ought never spoil the beauty and the appeal of the Capitol and its grounds by surface parking lots. We accomplish both the landscaping of the Capitol Grounds and the parking facilities in this project.

The land has already been bought. The core drillings have been done. The architectural and engineering services are in progress.

Mr. Chairman, we can, if we want, put off, but we cannot get rid of the need for this facility. I call attention to the fact that in other needed facilities here on Capitol Hill in the years gone by delays of one sort or another were caused and the ultimate result was that the Congress was denied the use of the facilities for an extra number of years and the cost of the construction went up a great deal. Therefore, all that was accomplished was the loss of time and expenditure in the long run of more money than otherwise would have been necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this would happen in the instance of these garages if the House approves this amendment and further delays this work.

They tell us that by January or February they will be ready to occupy enough of the Rayburn Building parking facilities to move all the cars now parked on these two squares and make room so that the work can begin.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will let this work go ahead to its completion so that within the not too distant future we will have a workable facility here. It will add 1,220 badly needed parking spaces underground but of course it will at the same time displace some 500 existing surface parking spaces.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been estimated that we require well over 3,000 parking spaces for the Members and the employees who work in the House Office Buildings and here at the Capitol. The space we have in the Cannon Office Building plus the space in the Rayburn Building and this underground garage will add up to just 3,120.

In addition to that we hope that this will make available parking spaces on the plaza, now used by employees, for our constituents when they come to visit the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to pay a compliment and tribute to Chief Sullivan of the Capitol Police Force and the members of the Capitol Police Force who have been most courteous in assisting my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, we have a real problem here with all the schoolchildren, and the general public, who come here particularly in the summertime to visit their

Nation's Capitol. There is not nearly enough parking space to accommodate them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out these facts to the members of the Committee. When one makes the adjustments in the cost for these parking spaces to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] referred, one comes out with a figure of about \$5,800 per space. It may seem like a large sum, but the cost of a parking space in the Cannon Building, built in 1958, was \$4,780. I might say the so-called legislative garage, which is more properly called the Senate garage, built in 1931, cost \$4,630.

So I do not think in the per car cost there has been a great deal of inflation, when it is only a small amount over the cost per car of the garage built in 1931.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say this matter has been considered very seriously by the House Office Building Commission when the late Speaker was chairman and the Commission consisted of Speaker Rayburn, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

It has also been considered by the present House Office Building Commission, of which I am chairman, the other two Members being the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

The decision in both cases has been unanimous.

We feel that this underground garage is necessary in connection with the Members of the House and their staffs being able to render adequate service to the people of their respective districts and to the people of our country. The observation that has been made by the chairman of the subcommittee is absolutely correct in relation to cost. This garage must be built sooner or later. If it is done later the cost will increase substantially. We know that based upon past experience.

I join with the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Washington in urging that this amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. STINSON. I would suggest we are going to compound a problem we have already if we start to build these two parking garages, because we are going to have the Rayburn parking facility fully in operation. I think our timing here on building these parking garages is wrong. I think they could easily be delayed for a year until after the Rayburn Building is operative and the 250 parking places in each of these squares are available when they could start parking in the Rayburn Building.

If we eliminate these two parking places we are going to have much more of a parking problem than already exists. We cannot have a firm estimate of just exactly when these Rayburn Building facilities are going to be operational.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to observe that we went into this angle. It is expected that the Rayburn Building basement and the parking facilities there will be available in January, so it has already been anticipated.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Even if they may have to give a little bit here and there, it will be in this fiscal year, and the work of the Rayburn Building is far enough along so that we can anticipate using that. So there is no serious question about the availability of substitute parking when these lots are cleared. In any event, the work will not be started until later.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The question is, Where are you going to get the money for all these things?

Mr. HORAN. I thought I had gone into that in my prepared speech. I do not think money is being wasted upon the House of Representatives. I am not for Central Government running everything. I am for States rights and local responsibilities, I should like to say to the gentleman, and I want Members of Congress to have the facilities to come here and fight for the home folks as well as to enact wise Federal legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
Printing and binding

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress; not to exceed \$7,500 for printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 182); printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register (including the Code of Federal Regulations) as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 309, 311, 311a); and printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipients; \$18,200,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 24, line 6, strike the figure 18,200,000 and insert in lieu thereof the

following: "18,173,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the printing or distribution of wall calendars requisitioned and distributed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives;".

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it will not take 5 minutes to explain what I am attempting to do here. The subcommittee on this bill has recommended that a substantially smaller quantity would probably serve the purpose. It also states that this was started some time ago. At the present time they are printing 51,469 of these calendars at a cost of \$27,473. I think, in talking with many of the Members, it becomes more of a nuisance than any benefit, and therefore I would move to discontinue this by cutting the appropriation \$27,000, providing that this appropriation shall not be available for the printing or distribution of wall calendars.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here again I find myself in the position of fighting for something that I have very limited need for. But, the fact that I do not find these calendars to be very attractive is an exception. We find that nearly 400 Members of the House do receive additional copies, and many of them tell me that they would be in some difficulty if this item, now that it has been so long established, were denied to them. The subcommittee went into it thoroughly. We thought the total was getting a little high, and we tried to find every way in this bill that we reasonably could to hold things down, to make it a little tighter, more austere, figuring that was the temper of the House. We thought that a smaller quantity would suffice. We tried to put it in that approach. To just wipe it all out is going to cause as much difficulty, I think, as it will good. I hope that the House will support the committee and let us see what one more year will do about this item. I believe if they will bear with us, that with all the things we have got going, we probably can bring this item down within reason and at the same time still keep available the use of this calendar. Many of our own agencies here are not allowed to have commercial calendars, and obviously we need to have provision made. A calendar is nothing more than an ordinary item of office stationery. Every home, every office in America has calendars.

I would just like for the committee to have a report on this item at least for the coming year to see if we cannot get this thing to where it is more in line and makes more sense.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, from my own experience and observation I do not think that any expenditure of the Federal moneys in comparable amount has contributed more to building the spirit of love of country and respect for its Government among the young people of America. I send these calendars to all of the schools in my district. They hang there and there is no name on them, no advertising of person or product, a symbol of our country, its Congress, and its laws. Just

a picture of the Capitol of the United States and the dome. The reaction I get to it is very heartening. I think these calendars perform a great service for our country.

I hope the amendment will be crushingly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems appropriate to me at this time while we are on printing to direct attention to the earlier statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who is here, relative to the "trash and trivia and tripe" as he described insertions in the RECORD of the Members of Congress. I personally take exception to that, and I say to my colleagues most respectfully that while I may disagree with many of the statements put in the RECORD because I do not share that particular philosophy or because I disagree with the gentleman who put in views with which I disagree, I certainly shall not foreclose any Member from expressing his views. When I see any Member of this House, knowing the expenditures we run up in the course of a year, saying that as an economy move we will hamstring or curtail the efforts of the Members of Congress themselves to be heard and speak for their districts, I must object. Indeed, if you want some type of rule, Mr. Chairman, I would say, well enough, let us all have the same number of lines, if that is what you want, if you want to limit the Members of Congress to be heard. However, limiting the freedom of speech on the floor of this House, or the freedom to use the RECORD and calling Member's views trash and trivia I think is wrong. I do a lot of my work at night in order to have my remarks ready. I can redo these and not use any extraneous material, but we have access to the best brains in the United States who are writing their views, with which we may agree or disagree. When we take that material, editorial or otherwise, and tie in our own thoughts I think we render a service. I say even to those with whom I have disagreed, I have had a tremendous benefit from each of you as I read your views and your extraneous material. I will not accuse any of you of putting trash and trivia in the RECORD when I may disagree with a commencement speech, or some other editorial or material that you use. Therefore I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Missouri, who is with us now. Can the gentleman give us at this time examples of trash and trivia and tripe placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Members doing this?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I cannot give you any examples of what I would consider to be trash and tripe and trivia that is inserted in the RECORD. I have made speeches on the floor of the House calling attention to certain local eulogies and writeups of local problems, and recipes for cherry pies, and other remarks made by people who are not prominent, and editorials. The ques-

tion is not that I disagree with their content, but that they are not of such a literary standard that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be used to give some status to them. In that respect I think that the Member has an opportunity to use some selectivity in the type of material he puts into the RECORD. I think if he will exercise some choice we can elevate and improve the standard of the material that has been appearing in the RECORD. I have made detailed studies of this and I have on occasion printed in the RECORD some of the material I feel falls into this category. I am not trying to restrict anybody's freedom of speech.

What I have said on the floor here today is not intended to limit any Member in the future in expressing his views to any extent he wishes. But it is intended to cut out editorials and articles merely to fill up the RECORD and to leave the impression that somebody has made a great study and a great contribution when the contribution is not worth the paper it is printed on.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I merely asked the gentleman to make a statement of the Members who have inserted this material and examples of this material. He may have those. I renew that request. I had not intended for him to comment otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not set myself up as a censor of any other Member of the House, nor do I think any other Member has that privilege. Whatever we do, let us apply it equally to all Members. I happen to disagree with the gentleman, and I do so respectfully. I happen to think that a Member of Congress may put material in the RECORD with which I may disagree, but I do not call it trash or trivia. That is his view, not mine. I decry the efforts of the gentleman in trying to censor the rest of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to say that I think the entire House will agree with me that this great committee, headed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] has performed a distinct and important service in the fine, well-considered bill which it has reported to this Chamber.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with

the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 122, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]
YEAS—271

Addabbo	Cooley	Gialmo
Albert	Corman	Gibbons
Anderson	Curtin	Gilbert
Andrews	Daddario	Gill
Arends	Dague	Glenn
Ashley	Daniels	Gonzalez
Ashmore	Davis, Ga.	Grabowski
Aspinall	Dawson	Grant
Auchincloss	Delaney	Gray
Avery	Denton	Green, Pa.
Baker	Diggs	Griffiths
Barrett	Dingell	Hagan, Ga.
Barry	Donohue	Hagen, Calif.
Bass	Dowdy	Halleck
Bates	Downing	Hanna
Battin	Dulski	Hansen
Beckworth	Duncan	Harding
Belcher	Dwyer	Hardy
Bennett, Mich.	Edmondson	Harvey, Ind.
Blatnik	Edwards	Hawkins
Boggs	Elliott	Hays
Bolling	Everett	Healey
Bolton	Evins	Hébert
Frances P. Bolton	Fallon	Hechler
Oliver P. Bolton	Farbstein	Henderson
Bonner	Fascell	Hollfield
Brademas	Feighan	Holland
Brooks	Finnegan	Horan
Brown, Calif.	Fino	Horton
Broyhill, Va.	Fisher	Huddleston
Burke	Flood	Hull
Burkhalter	Flynt	Ichord
Burleson	Ford	Jarman
Byrne, Pa.	Fountain	Jennings
Cahill	Fraser	Jensen
Cameron	Friedel	Joelson
Cannon	Fulton, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.
Carey	Fulton, Tenn.	Johnson, Wis.
Casey	Fuqua	Jones, Ala.
Cederberg	Gallagher	Jones, Mo.
Celler	Garmatz	Karsten
Chenoweth	Gary	Karth
Clark	Gathings	Kastenmeier
	Gavin	Kee

Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczyński
Kornegay
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meador
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Nygaard

O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmer
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pitcher
Pillion
Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden

Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson
Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—122

Abbitt
Abele
Adair
Alger
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Findley
Foreman
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin

Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeben
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClary
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Malliard
Marsh
May
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly

Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebell
Schweiker
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Watson
Whalley
Wharton
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyder
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—39

Abernethy
Ayres
Baring
Boland
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Chelf
Cohelan
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Dorn

Fogarty
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Harris
Hemphill
Kilburn
Kirwan
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Nelsen

Ostertag
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
St Germain
Sheppard
Springer
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Nelsen against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Williams against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Bray against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Brock against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Boland.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Willis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and to include certain tabulations and other material in connection with the bill.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX RATE AND OF CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 396, Rept. No. 379), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a one-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on

Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF MASTER CONTROL RECORDS BRANCH OF THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention that the Secretary of the Air Force proposes to transfer from the District of Columbia area, all records and information with regard to appointees and nominees to the U.S. Air Force Academy as well as the records of the cadets already in training at the Academy. This proposed move is of great concern to me, as it should be to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have directed a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force protesting this transfer as follows:

JUNE 11, 1963.

HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary, U.S. Air Force, The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has recently come to my attention that the Air Force Academy's Master Control Records Branch, presently located here in Washington, is scheduled to be moved to the Air Force Academy in Colorado. Such a move is beyond my comprehension, if efficiency, convenience and expediency are taken into consideration, and, as often as Senators and Congressmen must contact this office for immediate and vital information, it is impossible not to consider these factors.

I cannot see where the transfer of the Master Control Records Branch would be any more economical, or where it would be beneficial to those who use it most frequently, but rather how impractical it would be. Right now the operation is running smoothly, and my office is able to secure information at a moment's notice. Your Cadet Branch has always been ready, willing and able to answer inquiries from my office in a most knowledgeable and courteous manner, and has been largely responsible for my office being able to maintain an efficient and well-organized operation, as well. The cooperation and results we receive from your Academy Cadet Branch are excellent.

I would like to take this opportunity to strongly recommend the retention of this Master Control Records Branch here in Washington, so it can continue to operate

as it has in the past under its excellent supervision. Your kind consideration and assistance for gaining a favorable decision to this request will be sincerely and gratefully appreciated.

I would appreciate your early and personal reply to this letter.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

JAMES B. UTT,
Member of Congress.

I am also introducing a resolution on this subject which states that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that these records should remain in the District of Columbia area. I hope that many of my colleagues, who share these views, will protest this transfer by introducing a companion resolution.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems of the past decade concerns the need to ban nuclear weapons test. The advantages of such a ban are obvious and all nations agree that such an accomplishment would be a crucial and giant step toward what all thinking men pray for—a lasting peace.

For the past 5 years, we have traveled a difficult and sometime tortuous route in our negotiations with the Soviets, but impediments have prevented us from reaching our goal—which in simplest terms is a treaty with adequate safeguards against cheating. Our adversary has been at times intransigent, but I believe that the odds are not insurmountable.

Through the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations almost every type of proposal has been advanced, modified, revised, changed, and resubmitted—but so far a successful treaty has eluded us.

On June 4 I spoke on the floor and mentioned the difficulties and dangers confronting us on the international scene. On that occasion I paid tribute to His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, whose saintly and wise thinking has had a profound effect on me. At that time I said:

It is not difficult to suggest easy solutions to our domestic problems nor to solve the potential international tinderboxes which are smoldering from Cuba to Plaine des Jarres. The difficulties lie in working out acceptable solutions in the complex middle grounds between absolutes. It is in this area that our democratic society has shown its greatest strength.

Yesterday the President announced two important decisions: First, that he had agreed with Prime Minister Macmillan and Premier Khrushchev that high-level discussions should be held in Moscow on a test-ban treaty; and second, he pledged that the United States would not conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states would not do so. I commend the President on these concrete moves toward peace. These steps are practical and realistic

opening wedges. The United States has clearly extended its open hand to our opponents—let us hope that it is received with the same warmth that it was extended.

Following such an important proposal, I would hope that partisan reaction could be kept to a minimum. I stress this because of the impact of the success or failure that such negotiations could have on all of us and because there seems to be an almost reflex action on the part of some to any constructive proposal made by the administration.

I say this again because I have been reading and hearing about one of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle who is proposing a bold move, and to leave the dismal failures of the past behind which superficially appear to be quick and easy ways to achieve a test-ban treaty. My colleague calls for fallout limitation and commented that the U.S. administration should stop tilting windmills and direct its attention to practical steps to deal with whatever future risks may be involved in continued unrestricted atmospheric testing.

Following the President's speech at American University, the automatic reflex again jerked into action and those emotionally charged words such as "a soft line" and "going hat in hand to Moscow to beg" came forth. I can assure any and all that the hand that guided our country through the October 1962 crises was a strong hand which has never and will never go "hat in hand" anywhere.

I would simply like to suggest that work on this vitally important test-ban treaty is not taken casually, but is a deadly serious business. It does not call for a partisan approach, but it does call for a bi-partisan attempt to work out an agreement which we hope will save the world from a nuclear holocaust.

As far as a proposal for a "fall-out limitation," as I mentioned, almost every other approach to this issue, has been tried or mentioned sometime during our past negotiations. Concerning "fall-out limitation," I would like to quote from a speech made by our distinguished colleague, Carl Durham, former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to the National Association of Manufacturers in New York on May 21, 1958, on the subject of "Radiation Hazards Facing the State and the Nation." Carl, who was then chairman of the committee, said:

All of us, quite naturally, would oppose any international agreement on testing which would endanger the national security and weaken the resources of the free world relative to the Communist world. On the other hand, it seems to me that there may be a useful area to explore, namely, agreement on limitation of the amount of fissionable material which is deposited in the atmosphere by nuclear weapons tests. Such agreement would be an important first step toward the ultimate cessation of tests and would serve the vital purpose of cutting down on the amount of radio-active contamination of the world's atmosphere.

In the same vein, Senator ANDERSON, one of our associates from the other body, commented similarly in a speech made in New York on August 5, 1959,

entitled "Policies for a Nuclear Future." At that time, he said:

In 1957 the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee held public hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effects on man. Based on the testimony and the facts brought out during those hearings, I suggested, at the time, that we should seek agreement with other nations on an atmospheric limitation of fission products. I continue to feel that, lacking agreement of cessation of all tests coupled with a reliable inspection and detection system, it is important at least to reach agreement on limitation of fission products put into the atmosphere by testing.

I have just completed 3 days of hearings on fallout radiation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, where the subcommittee reviewed all aspects of this crucial problem in what I believe was a dispassionate and objective manner. I hope that the closely related test ban issue can be handled in the same way.

In his encyclical "Pacem in Terris," Pope John XXIII, made a profound observation which I believe bears repeating. The pontiff said:

Peace on earth, which men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed. The progress of learning and the inventions of technology clearly show that, both in living things and in the forces of nature, an astonishing order reigns, and they also bear witness to the greatness of man, who can understand that order and create suitable instruments to harness those forces of nature and use them to his benefit.

I would like to end my brief comments by making a plea to all of my colleagues who are interested in the field of international negotiations on nuclear weapons, that we work quietly and unsensationally in the cause of peace with honor, and cast aside easy solutions which grab headlines but little else.

JOE H. ADAMS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Miami, Fla., as the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to incorporate a copy of the bill in the RECORD as part of my remarks and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a resolution of the Harvey W. Seeds Post of the American Legion of Miami asking the Congress to designate this hospital to one of its members—one of the outstanding Legionnaires of the country, a national vice commander of the American Legion.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. PEPPER. I am introducing the bill, but I wanted to incorporate a copy of the bill in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the reason I reserve the right to object is this—and I think the gentleman will agree with me. By including the resolution, I think the gentleman from Florida is burdening the RECORD, as well as in printing the bill. If that were put in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, it would not burden the permanent RECORD. The bill would speak for itself and the resolution could appear in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. In view of the statement I made today of what I am trying to accomplish, I would respectfully object to including that material in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me so I may respond?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I made a simple and I thought a proper request to include this memorial in the body of the RECORD. I am willing to withdraw my request to include the bill and just let the notation of the introduction of it appear in the proper place in the RECORD. But I have a 1½-page resolution from the American Legion Post of Miami of which this man was a member, memorializing the Congress to enact this bill and I feel it proper that that memorial appear in the body of the RECORD.

I have not made any similar request today and I do not often make such requests. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, this matter is obviously a matter directly pertinent to the bill which the gentleman is introducing. It is not a matter extraneous to the legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the memorial to which I referred is as follows:

Whereas authorization for the construction of a new hospital by the Veterans' Administration, in Dade County, Fla., has heretofore been authorized by law; and

Whereas Joe H. Adams, now deceased, was a distinguished citizen of the State of Florida, a former national vice commander of the American Legion, a past commander of Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion Department of Florida; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge among veterans of Dade County, and the general public thereof, that Joe H. Adams in life contributed in time, effort, and resources, in the aggregate, more than any other single individual to the authorization, by the Congress, of construction of said new veterans' hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, Department of Florida, on the 45th birthday anniversary of the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled, with distinguished guests as follows: National Vice Commander Pat Reese; National Executive Committeeman E. Meade Wilson; alternate National Executive Committeeman Billy Anderson; Department Commander Arthur M. MacCarthy; Southern Area Commander Edwin K. Palmer; 10th District Commander Allan

Kelley; and with the concurrence of all posts of the American Legion comprising the 10th District, Department of Florida, in Dade and Monroe Counties, does memorialize the Congress to enact legislation giving to the new veterans' hospital to be erected in Miami, Dade County, Fla., the name: "Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital"; and be it further

Resolved, That this post, in conjunction with all other posts in the said 10th District, be instructed to forward copies of this resolution, duly attested, to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to U.S. Senators SPASSARD L. HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, and to U.S. Congressmen DANTE FASCELL and CLAUDE PEPPER.

PROCEDURES FOR AWARDED DEFENSE CONTRACTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, disturbing elements of change are being experienced in our Government's practices relative to awarding defense contracts. I know this is a subject which is spiced with emotional, economic, and political considerations. I am not unmindful that such reactions are not without rationalization in terms of district and State problems. I would, however, ask that the membership review for a few moments some rather sobering aspects of the shift and change we are presently experiencing and anticipating in growing velocity. In requesting your indulgence may I suggest you do so solely to determine within the framework of our national concern for our national security. Let us ask what we as a Congress can support as policy to obtain for the American taxpayers the best in national defense—in weaponry, in space, for each dollar we spend.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States should be complimented on the advantages it has built into its present bid procedures. These procedures as they have been gradually refined and developed provide for a stage-by-stage development of negotiations with interested industrial firms. The firms are induced to make refined proposals on a projected space craft, missile vehicle, or guidance system.

At each stage, like musical chairs, some bidders are eliminated from the competition. At each of several stages, the Defense Department allows each selected competitor a stated sum of money for a limited period of time to refine and exact their proposal in terms of flexibility of performance, reliability, lowest cost, and highest ultimate level of performance. The real carrot is the final contract award.

In practice this has induced the major competing companies to plow back portions of the past earnings into the greatest of research and development efforts during these negotiation stages. Since the contract goes to only one bidder, there is a real meaning in the word

"risk" attached to the "risk capital" of the several contending firms spent in the negotiations.

However, gentlemen, I know from my own constituents that those risks are willingly assumed where there is assurance that the contract in question will ultimately be awarded on the basis of the merit of the final proposals. This is the kind of challenge which has always encouraged the highest performance from our private enterprise system.

Now, sirs, what do you suppose will happen to this incentive and this effort, if it can be demonstrated that the ultimate award is not made on the basis of true merit—not made on the demonstrated, illustrated superiority of the proposal? Will the incentive be as keen? Will the risk capital be so readily advanced if what tips the scale is not the worthiness, the superiority but rather some other extraneous fact, such as comparative employment figures or area percentages of allocation of contract?

May we be reminded that we are here talking about the most important, single activity of our times. The maintenance of the free world leadership and the protection of our Government and the security of our people from a known, aggressive, and resourceful adversary. We are here talking about a new strata of combat—the technological struggle between ourselves and the Russians. A struggle which if decisively won by either side could very well be the single determinant as to which will emerge as victorious and dominant. We are not here talking about a tool for the correction of some of our internal and domestic problems.

Assuming that there was any validity to such a distorted use of the defense program, what results would we expect. May we suggest the following: Out of the careful competitive approach outlined above certain firms have emerged on merit alone as final prime contractors. They employ skilled, well-paid, tax-paying workmen and engineers in their home plants who will work on the part of the contract to be performed in the plant of the successful bidder. Then the successful bidder will subcontract a sizable portion of the total work to other plants throughout the United States all of whom employ skilled, well-paid, tax-paying workmen and engineers and all of whom have been part of the "team" effort to win the contract. This latter represents the "buy" activity of the prime contractor and can involve, as I shall demonstrate, as much as 66 percent of the award money in the prime contract.

May I use a specific illustration, Mr. Speaker? I am sure the Members are aware of the Minuteman missile program. The major contract on this program went on competitive merit to the firm of Autonetics, now operating largely in Orange County. The total award on this contract was \$401.5 million. The in-plant manufacturing and development represents 34 percent of the award. Sixty-six percent or \$264.6 million represents production bought from other manufacturing plants located in 20 States.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I will insert a complete breakdown

of not only the States involved but the companies within such States and the

amount of subcontract commitment in dollars each company has involved:

List of Minuteman program subcontractors

State	Item	Total amount committed to date	State	Item	Total amount committed to date
ARIZONA			MINNESOTA		
Motorola, Inc., 5005 East McDowell Rd., Phoenix.	Transistors	\$5,388,954	Minneapolis Honeywell Co., 2600 Rigway Rd., Minneapolis.	Gyro	\$5,881,901
CALIFORNIA				Piga	3,098,200
Continental Device, 12515 South Chadron Ave., Hawthorne.	Diodes	855,283	Total		8,980,101
Pacific Semiconductors, Inc., 12955 South Chadron Ave., Hawthorne.	do	11,436,671	NEBRASKA		
Ultronix, Inc., 111 East 30th Ave., San Mateo.	Resistors	1,414,001	Dale Electronics, Inc., 1356 28th Ave., Columbus.	Resistors	553,332
Giannini Controls, 1000 South Mountain Ave., Duarte.	Digital resolvers	236,382	NEW JERSEY		
Cannon Electric, 1649 South Central, Glendale.	Receptacles	235,020	Bendix Corp., Eclipse Pioneer Division, Route 46, Teterboro.	P67 sensing element	1,647,659
Alresearch Manufacturing Co., 9851 Sepulveda, Los Angeles.	Blower	290,165	Mepco, Inc., 35 Abbot Ave., Morristown.	Piga	298,976
Convair, 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego.	Body section	697,675	Resistors		
RCA Data Systems Division, 8500 Balboa Blvd., Van Nuys.	N10 chassis, base, and cover	944,823	Total		3,971,868
Sperry Rand Corp., Vickers, Inc., Division, 2160 East Imperial Highway, El Segundo.	Computers chassis	573,582	NEW YORK		
Magna Mill-Hydro Mill, H. W. Loud, 969 East 2d St., Pomona; 10533 Sessler, 1707 South Gate, Cloverfield, Santa Monica.	C53	1,548,410	Sperry Gyroscope Co., Lakeville Rd., Great Neck, Long Island, N.Y.	Platform structure	1,231,000
Amphenol Borg, 9201 Independence Ave., Chatsworth.	Auxiliary power supply	8,570,588	General Electric Co., Semiconductor Products Division, Electronic Park, Syracuse.	Memory unit	2,236,000
Fairchild Semiconductors, 545 Whisman Rd., Mountain View.	Machined platform	3,367,546	IMC Magnetics, 570 Main St., Westbury, Long Island, N.Y.	Gyrocompass	91,000
Raytheon Co., 350 Ellis St., Mount View.	Cables	3,373,643	Reeves Instruments, East Gate Blvd., Roosevelt Field, Garden City.	Resolvers	58,374
Total	Transistors	4,534,680	Diodes	Transistors	1,296,730
	Diodes	1,393,987	Diodes	Diodes	1,287,040
	Transistors	579,282	Blower	Blower	148,863
			C96		111,308
			C92		73,721
			Total		6,554,036
			NORTH CAROLINA		
CONNECTICUT			Shalleross Manufacturing Co., Preston St., Selma.	Resistors	23,005
Eastern Industries, Hamden.	C24 air conditioners	291,460	OHIO		
Sperry Rand Corp., Wheeler Electronic Division, 150 East Aurora, Waterbury.	Transformers	5,862,159	Borg Warner, Pesco Division, 24700 North Miles Rd., Bedford.	Auxiliary power supply	7,195,823
Total		6,153,619	PENNSYLVANIA		
ILLINOIS			Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh.	Diodes	233,437
Cook Electric, 8100 Manticello Rd., Skokie.	C24 programmer	219,950	IRC, 401 North Broad St., Philadelphia.	Resistors	2,318,176
John E. Fast, 3590 East Elston Ave., Chicago.	C91 programmer	285,315	Corning Glass Works, 540 High St., Bradford.	Capacitors	1,626,407
Astro Metallic Corp., 7401 West Lawrence Ave., Chicago.	Capacitors	531,981	Total		4,178,020
	Gyro details	443,827	SOUTH CAROLINA		
Total		1,481,073	General Electric Co., Irmo.	Capacitors	2,476,428
INDIANA			TEXAS		
Delco Remy, 2401 Columbus Ave., Anderson.	Batteries	2,713,297	Texas Instruments, 6000 Lemmon Ave., Dallas.	Alignment unit	2,402,239
Delco Radio Division, 700 East Firmin, Kokomo.	Transistors	525,845		Integrated circuits	8,072,115
Total		3,239,142		Transistors	2,313,894
KANSAS				C21	347,727
Electra Manufacturing Co., 800 North 21st St., Independence.	Resistors	53,530		C92	117,584
MASSACHUSETTS				Diodes	69,836
Nortronics, Norwood.	Gyro compass	4,129,000		Servo cylinders	10,264,877
Transistron Electronic Corp., 168 Albion St., Wakefield.	Transistors	299,000	Total		29,588,272
Solid State Products, Inc., 1 Pinegroe St., Salem.	Diodes	2,085,063	VIRGINIA		
Sprague Electric, North Adams.	Diodes	82,488	Melpar, 3000 Arlington Ave., Falls Church.	Hi-rel boards	82,816,313
	Capacitors	1,955,710	WISCONSIN		
Total		9,451,291	Allen Bradley Co., 136 West Greenfield Ave., Milwaukee.	Resistors	6,461,204
MICHIGAN					
A-C Spark Plug, Flint.	Piga	1,370,421			

A careful scrutiny of this list is recommended to the Congressmen from the districts in which these plants are located. These subcontracts exhibit a pattern of buying by a firm which has demonstrated with the help of these subcontracts a superior ability in the race for merit. If awards are now to be given on some other basis to other firms then I suggest you only create an unwarranted shift of the unemployment problem. It should be evident that the only jobs involved are in the contract. None are created by the shift. Not only will un-

warranted displacement be caused in areas where superior skills and know-how are presently demonstrated as prime contractors' locations, but more significantly there is likely to be disruption in the total buy pattern that exists in the present team configuration and we will have to wait and conjecture as to what new patterns of buy in terms of both the mix and the location will emerge. The quality of our programs will suffer. Established economic balance predicated on sound business relationships will suffer and we will still have

our present problem of unemployment with a different spread because of military procurement shift.

Finally, gentlemen, what do I hope to have demonstrated in this presentation—these few points. Defense contracts are intricate matters involving interrelations between the economics of many States. These relationships have arisen out of a partnership of competitiveness which has contributed immeasurably to the sophistications and improvements of the American effort in advanced weaponry and the penetration of space. The

evolved practice of awarding contracts has produced a pretesting for merit, before award, that gives our Defense Department the superior effort of our defense industry. If this is not so, then let us have suggestions which will improve these selection methods and avoid practices which erode and destroy both the selection and the incentive for the maximum output our research and development are capable of achieving.

We should emphasize that all parts of our economy and our Nation should enter the lists in these contests of merit. Every procedure to keep the lists open and vigorously competitive should be encouraged. But throughout we should be mindful of the real job the tool we are forging is intended to accomplish and we must sharpen rather than dull the edge of its effectiveness.

For other problems let us turn to other tools. Tools less costly to divert to such use. Tools more capable of achieving the ends we seek. You would not seek a general surgeon for a delicate brain operation. It is not the American way to seek less than the best. We are engaged in a grim contest for the highest of stakes—the award for second place is not pleasant to contemplate. Taking second best is the surest pathway to ultimate second place in the fatal sweepstakes. All that any section of the Nation should seek, all that any representatives can ask, is that our defense effort be the best our scientific and industrial know-how can produce. That is all I ask.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

INCLUDING TABULATION IN REMARKS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my original request to include a tabulation in the remarks I made earlier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ALABAMA TO MINE ITS BILLIONTH TON OF COAL THIS YEAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 17-18 the 46th Anniversary Convention of the National Coal Association will take place in Washington. The

meeting holds perhaps more interest than any other session, inasmuch as a good portion of the agenda will be devoted to transportation and research.

The incredible advances in the entire concept of coal transportation now taking place offer outstanding opportunities to an industry that for many years has been beset with burdensome costs for moving its product from mine to market. While southern railroads have for some time operated on the principle that greater efficiency and lower costs are possible through trainload movements of a bulk product, other lines are now following suit and in the past several months have slashed freight rates drastically through the introduction of the unit train. The resultant savings to consumers have come about through the close cooperation of mine operators, railroad companies, and electric utilities. The magnitude of the savings can be appreciated when it is realized that a ton of coal, a year ago assessed from \$4 to \$4.50 for a trip from northern West Virginia or western Pennsylvania to the east coast, can now be delivered for as much as \$1.50 less.

The NCA convention transportation panel will include not only a railroad expert, but a representative of a waterways operators association as well as electric company and coal company speakers.

Since America's energy requirements will demand maximum utilization of all fuel resources, the new emphasis on coal research is of national interest. As one of the original supporters of legislation establishing the Office of Coal Research, I look forward to the reports that will be made on June 18 by spokesmen for organizations participating in the OCR program.

Those of us responsible for creating the Office of Coal Research did not, of course, expect a scientific or engineering miracle that would stimulate an immediate sharp upturn in coal demand, yet we were confident that enough progress would be made in the early years of the research program to give us some idea of new development possibilities. NCA President Stephen F. Dunn has arranged for representatives of research organizations handling OCR contracts to participate in the convention panel of June 18. Their report will be of interest to all Members of Congress, particularly those of us from coal States.

As customary, Alabama will be represented at the convention. Nineteen hundred and sixty-three will be a monumental year for our State, in that Alabama's mines will produce their billionth ton of bituminous coal next November or December. A national emergency requiring a tremendous increase in coal could move the date ahead, of course, and by the same token an unexpected decline could conceivably carry over this landmark event into 1964. Citizens of Alabama do not, however, expect the demand curve either to soar upward or jackknife down. We therefore invite America to take special notice when our billionth ton is extracted in the closing weeks of this year.

Mr. Speaker, as early as 1834 coal was shipped from a spot near Tuscaloosa

down the Black Warrior River to Mobile. Two years later mining activity got underway in the Birmingham district, where it was loaded on barges and taken down the Coosa River. Coke was made from Alabama coal in 1854. The industry moved slowly, but gradually more and more mining operations got underway—in Tuscaloosa County, in Jefferson County, and in Walker County. We exceeded the million-ton mark for the first time in 1883. By then, coal had become an integral component of Alabama's growing industrial complex, and in the years to follow it has remained one of our major resources.

Alabama's mines had the best year in 1926, when output exceeded 21 million tons. As has been the experience of other mining States, production has declined substantially since the immediate post-World War II years. From 1947, when we sent 19 million tons of bituminous coal to market, production curved downward to slightly less than 13 million tons 2 years later. Since that time Alabama has been more fortunate than most other mining States in that the variations from year to year have been slight. Last year's output amounted to 14,300,000 tons, and we look forward to approximately the same level in this memorable year.

We hope that by marking the production of our billionth ton, we will call to the attention of the Nation's business and industry leaders the potential of Alabama's coal industry. Alabama is in the heart of a geographical area where diversified natural resources equal or excel any other region in the United States. The South has petroleum, natural gas, and water power in addition to coal; we have iron ore, limestone, graphite, phosphate rock, bauxite, and a myriad of other ingredients to attract industry.

Alabama's excellent transportation system includes a network of railroad lines that move about 90 percent of the total output of our coal mines. Our river system includes the Tombigbee and Black Warrior, which join the Alabama, Coosa, and Tallapoosa Rivers to form the great Mobile River Basin.

From Mobile our coal moves into the export market, most of it to South America.

I would hope that the U.S. Department of Commerce will interest itself to the extent that some participation will be planned in observance of Alabama's billionth ton. In taking notice, both government and industry must look upon this event as a landmark along the way to a far greater industrial program. We will have removed but a small portion of the bountiful coal reserves with which nature graciously endowed Alabama. In the 7,000 square miles of our coalfields are another 6,800 million tons of mineable reserves for America's heat and energy requirements of today and tomorrow. This storehouse is sufficient to satisfy the needs of the entire United States, at current rates of consumption, for 175 years.

The upcoming occasion is a special tribute to Alabama's mine operators and mine workers. Their service to our State and our Nation is appreciated. I hope

that the economy of the mining industry will improve in succeeding months and years, and I implore my colleagues to stand fast against any inequitable legislative proposals that might react to the disadvantage of this great industry. By the same token we must continue to encourage the coal research program which Congress will have an opportunity to review in detail at next week's meetings of the National Coal Association.

WORLD'S FAIR IN DETROIT IN 1972

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a sizable group of leading citizens of the city of Detroit who represent many segments of the people of Detroit, have joined together in an effort to work and plan to hold an official World's Fair in Detroit in the year 1972.

This citizen group has been incorporated under the title of "Detroit World's Fair, Inc.," and is a nonprofit organization.

This effort to hold a world's fair in Detroit in 1972 has already been endorsed by the Michigan State Legislature. A concurrent resolution was recently approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Michigan, and another resolution has been approved by the common council of the city of Detroit.

The dynamic city of Detroit is located in the heartland of America, and is easily accessible to millions of people in both the United States and Canada, and is located within 1 day's drive for at least 100 million people who would contemplate visiting a World's Fair.

The city of Detroit is nearing the completion of its redevelopment program, including the best freeways to allow for fast moving traffic, a magnificent civic center second to none in the United States, a novel and enchanting international village; and with the expansion of the cultural, medical, and university centers, plus the expansion providing for ample housing and other facilities to provide comfort, beauty, and convenience for all peoples, the city of Detroit will be more than ready to sponsor and hold the World's Fair in 1972.

A resolution was recently introduced in this House by several of the Congressmen from Michigan—including myself—calling attention to the fact that a World's Fair is being planned for Detroit in 1972. Following is the resolution:

Whereas the Common Council of the city of Detroit and the Michigan State Legislature have unanimously endorsed by resolution the holding of an official World's Fair in 1972 at Detroit, Michigan; and

Whereas the dynamic city of Detroit is located in the heartland of America, and is accessible to millions of people in both the United States and Canada, and is located within one day's drive for at least one hundred million people who would contemplate visiting a World's Fair; and

Whereas with the completion of Detroit's redevelopment program, freeways, international village, civic center, and the inner core of the city, including the medical, cultural and university centers, and the ample addition of housing as well as other facilities, Detroit will be more than ready for the holding of a World's Fair in 1972; and

Whereas Detroit is the oldest city in the United States west of the Alleghenies, having been established as wilderness outpost when all New France contained but a few thousand souls, chiefly crowded along the lower Saint Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec; and

Whereas Detroit's 262 year history has been leavened with the culture of many lands, from its inception as a colony and town of Fort Ponchartrain du Detroit, established by Antoine de Lamothe Cadillac in July 1701, and with its cosmopolitan population, Detroit is today a living symbol of all the cultures of the world; and

Whereas the dynamic city of Detroit, which was known internationally as the "Arsenal of Democracy" during two world wars, has become a metropolis of world renown and its industrial achievements materially influence the daily lives of almost every person on earth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to the citizens of Detroit and of Michigan, and to Detroit World's Fair, Incorporated, a nonprofit organization, for their activities in planning and working for the official World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit in 1972.

SUGARBEET PRODUCTION IN CAYUGA COUNTY, N.Y.—THE REAL FACTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] made some comments which were inserted in the body of the RECORD at page 10524 and following with respect to a project concerned with the development of a sugarbeet industry in my own congressional district, located at Auburn and in Cayuga County, N.Y. This city, by the way, is also the home of a very distinguished former Member of this body, Mr. John Taber, who also, I might add, supported this project.

I am a little distressed Mr. Speaker, at the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota. They show a failure to understand the meaning of the sugar legislation that was passed last year. The sugar bill of 1962 provided specifically for developing sugarbeet production in new areas which had not been producing sugar. The Department is following that legislation insofar as it is considering the application of Cayuga County. For once we are beginning now to look for the development of sugar production in the areas where the major users are located; namely, in the northeast portion of the country, instead of maintaining that only the western areas of the country can produce sugar, and that those of us who live in the Northeast are automatically

and forever to be barred from this kind of production.

But the law provides otherwise, Mr. Speaker, and the very reason the application of Cayuga County is being so seriously considered by the Agriculture Department is precisely because it so amply fills all of the various criteria set up within the law. If the gentleman from Minnesota has an area that he thinks might qualify under the 1962 act, let me suggest that he urge them also to apply to the Department and then let the Department decide just how well they actually do meet the criteria set forth in the law. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that we did once grow sugarbeets in Cayuga County, and the agricultural experts at Cornell University have told us that we can still grow them profitably there today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the assistance of the Area Redevelopment Administration is concerned, let me just point out to my friend from Minnesota that Cayuga County has been a seriously distressed unemployment area for many years. But instead of sitting around doing nothing, they have themselves developed this new idea of relieving their unemployment problem by creating a new sugar industry in the very backyard of some of the major sugar users in the country. So here is a classic example of a community taking steps on its own to deal with its own unemployment problems. And this is the very kind of thing which Congress said the ARA ought to do; namely, help local communities help themselves in solving their own unemployment problems. The funds they have advanced to Cayuga County have been designed to assist that community, and the Department of Agriculture, in getting underway a great new industry which will not only be of value to the community, but which also will go far toward easing the current sugar shortage in America.

Mr. Speaker, lest anyone think that this Cayuga County case is grist for political attacks, let me just point out that the Republican-controlled State government of New York is also solidly behind the project and has already advanced funds to help in the construction of the sugar refinery.

ADMISSION OF HUNGARY TO UNITED NATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks of my colleague from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE], and express regret that the United States did not offer a resolution at the United Nations questioning the credentials of the Hungarian delegation to the United Nations. It should be pointed out that the matter did not come to a vote, and that the U.S. delegation did not abstain or vote for or against the matter. It is true that this is a reversal of the previous

U.S. position. This new position was adopted because it was known that the seating of the Hungarian delegation would be achieved even if the United States opposed such action. When I learned this reversal was being considered, I protested to the President and urged that the United States continue its opposition to the seating of the Hungarian delegation. It was my feeling that it would be hypocrisy not to take such action when we condemn a similar situation 90 miles from our own shores. Both of these reigns are maintained against the will of the people and should receive similar treatment from the United States.

In response to my protest, the Department of State informed me that the reversal in policy was based upon the action of the Hungarian Government in releasing political prisoners, correction of judicial abuses, easing of passport and visa restrictions, changes in agricultural policy, and the desire of other U.N. members to seat the Hungarian delegation. Not satisfied, I wrote to the Secretary of State and informed him that I was horrified by the U.S. acceptance of a government whose known objective is against all the principles of the dignity of the human being.

I would prefer that the United States offer the resolution and be defeated.

While I agree with my colleague from New York on the present issue, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives that, in 1956 at the time of the Hungarian revolution, your Subcommittee on Europe requested positive action by the then administration to give assistance to the Hungarian freedom fighters. Your Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs sat by in New York, at the United Nations, with Ambassador Lodge, awaiting instructions from the administration for definitive action. This did not occur. I, therefore, say to you that, had positive action been taken on Hungary by the previous administration and we had gone to the aid of the Hungarian people, I am sure that there would be a free government in Hungary today and that the Cuban problem would not exist.

HOW FAR DO WE GO IN DEMONSTRATING OUR GOOD INTENTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy tells the American people it is necessary for us to further demonstrate our good faith in our dealings with the Russians, that we must continue to turn the other cheek so that the world will be sure we want peace.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, abhor war. I, too, have known the horrors of war and have had the soul-searing experience of losing a buddy in combat and have known the

pain of sending home to his family the last few possessions of my fallen comrade. I hate war and long for peace among men. My differences with the President is how best to insure that the peace will be maintained.

The President believes, from his public pronouncements, that the world will be at peace only if we refuse to antagonize the Communist government of the Soviet Union. The President's policy has been one of announced accommodation of the Russians.

It is my contention, backed up by recent history, that such a course does not lead to peace, but rather enhances the danger of war. We cannot evaluate within the meaning of the thinking of Americans the reaction of Communist officials. These two nations have entirely opposite objectives. Ours is to remain free and to permit all peoples the freedom of self-determination. The Communist objective, stated time and again by every Russian leader, and repeated constantly by the present dictator, Khrushchev, is Russian control of the world, the destruction of the capitalist system, and the defeat of the United States.

To achieve their objective the Communists honor no agreement, break treaties with regularity, use diplomatic conferences to lie, and resort to slavery and murder when it is convenient. They consider any moves toward the reconciliation of differences as a sign of weakness and immediately move in for the kill. It should be clear to all those in responsible positions in this Government, that the free world and the United States have lost ground since 1945 whenever we have appeared to be weak or indecisive and communism has been stopped only when we have a clear, forthright policy based on strength and determination.

American prestige is at its lowest ebb today and the Soviet Union is riding high because of the lack of policy, the weakness, the indecision of the Kennedy administration in meeting such problems as Russian invasion of the Western Hemisphere through Cuba, the declaration by Khrushchev that the Monroe Doctrine is dead, the attacks upon U.S. missions such as recently seen in Caracas, and the flyover of Russian bombers buzzing American ships on the high seas.

The story by Associated Press this week is terrifying in its implications. In an article entitled, "Six Red Jets Fly Over Carrier," we find this account:

Six Russian twin-jet medium bombers flew near the U.S. carrier *Ranger* in the Pacific yesterday and one of them swooped low over the 76,000-ton warship, the Navy says. It said the six Badger bombers flew near the U.S.-bound *Ranger* in international waters some 330 miles east of Japan. "One of the Soviet planes made a low pass close to the carrier," the announcement said. There was no indication the Badger made any more threatening move. The Russians were detected by the *Ranger's* radar and they were intercepted 65 to 100 miles away by the carrier's jets, which evidently had no difficulty reaching the slower-than-sound Badgers. Apparently the jets then escorted the Russians, keeping a close watch on them as they approached the carrier. The Badgers apparently came from Siberia or the Kamchatka Peninsula, well within their more

than 4,300-mile cruising range. The *Ranger* was the sixth U.S. aircraft carrier to be overflown by long-range Russian planes this year while far at sea in the Atlantic or Pacific. The last such incident occurred March 16. At that time, four long-range, four-jet Bear bombers made a series of flights over the carrier *Constellation* 600 miles southeast of Midway Island in the Pacific.

Six Red jets made a low pass over one of our carriers without protest from us and without interference. Our officials claim the Red jets were followed by our jets who were "keeping them under close watch," but they did not prevent their swooping low over our carrier. Any one of the Russian bombers, bent on a suicide mission, could have destroyed our ship, but the administration does not consider this a provocative act. Nor is this the first time of such provocation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has walked more than the mile necessary to show the world our good intentions, we have turned the other cheek until we are dizzy, and we still have not convinced the Communists. Instead they grow stronger and the world moves closer to war and to slavery. The best guarantee of the peace is to stand firm, serve notice on the Soviet Union we are ready to deal from strength on the problems confronting the world, but that future concessions must come from them, we will back down not an inch farther. If the world is to remain free it must have the leadership of a United States that is respected, not necessarily because of love, but respected because of our strength and our demonstrated will to protect ourselves and others who have the will to be free from further Russian conquests and Communist domination.

AMERICAN WORKERS MUST NOT BE FORCED TO PAY FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF HOLDING A JOB

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the ever-continued battle to preserve the freedom of the American people we must extend the fight to embrace all their freedoms, not only those threatened by a bureaucratic government, but those which are threatened by entrenched groups including labor unions. No man should have to pay for the privilege of holding a job, yet this is exactly what is meant by an agency shop. The latest Supreme Court decision in this area seriously threatens the freedom of a man to earn a living for himself and his family and in that there can be no greater suppression.

The Court decision will no doubt be followed by renewed efforts on the part of powerful labor bosses to wreck State right-to-work laws. The American people and Congress must be prepared to halt further onslaughts by labor on the freedoms of those who toil.

Mr. Speaker, in analyzing the Court decision on the agency shop, I agree with

the thinking in an editorial in the Dallas Morning News of June 5:

For almost a year, labor and management lawyers have anxiously awaited a Supreme Court ruling on the legality of a controversial labor contract gimmick known as the agency shop clause. This gimmick—devised more than 3 years ago—has been used by union officials as a method of making end runs around the right-to-work laws now in force in 20 States—

The editorial declares, and then goes on—

It is a contract agreement between unions and employers which forces nonunion workers to pay dues and other fees to the unions in order to hold their jobs.

The agency shop clause is unnecessary in States which do not have right-to-work laws—for in these States a union shop clause requiring employees to join a union within 30 to 60 days after they are hired can satisfy labor's goal of compulsory union membership.

But in States where a right-to-work law exists, the union shop clause is illegal. Hence the agency shop clause was conceived as a means of getting around these State laws. Technically, under an agency shop clause, no employee is forced to join a union. But he is forced to pay union dues, and if he refuses, he can be fired.

Thus, the major objectionable ingredient of the union shop clause—compulsion—is still present in the agency shop clause. And this is precisely what State right-to-work laws have been aiming to eliminate.

Many labor bosses, in fact, prefer the agency shop to the union shop clause, because it enables them to collect dues from all workers and to exercise control over their jobs, but does not bring with it the problem of recalcitrant union members who will insist on having a voice in the union's affairs.

If the Supreme Court had declared that agency shop agreements are legal in right-to-work States, the right-to-work laws of those States would have been rendered completely meaningless.

In its decision Monday, the Court did not hand down that opinion. At the same time, however, it did not clearly declare that agency shop agreements are illegal in right-to-work States. The broad principles enunciated by the Court were that Federal labor law does not prohibit agency shop contracts, which is true; and that States are free to ban such agreements, which is reasonable and seems to uphold right-to-work laws.

But the two cases heard by the Court both involved agency shop agreements made in right-to-work States. In one case, the Court held that the agreement violated the State right-to-work law and in the other it held that the agreement did not.

The right-to-work laws of both States are essentially the same, as were the agency shop agreements. How, then, could the Court declare the agency shop legal in one State and illegal in the other?

Apparently, the Court was unwilling to assert its own interpretation of the right-to-work laws in the two States involved. It merely accepted the findings of lower courts.

In Florida, where the Supreme Court declared that the agency shop was illegal, the Florida Supreme Court had made a similar decision. In Indiana, the State courts had held the agency shop clause to be compatible with right-to-work laws, so the Supreme Court took the same view.

Although we may be fortunate that the Supreme Court did not go deeper into the matter, the attitude it has taken amounts to judicial irresponsibility. If the Court is willing to hand down a decision in cases of this sort, it ought to be prepared to deal with the basic issues involved.

Until a clearer interpretation is rendered at a later date, we know little more about the status of the agency shop in right-to-work States than we did before the decision this week.

TRIBUTES TO JAPANESE AMERICAN MILITARY SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in them from time to time some extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, June 2, 1963, the Japanese American Citizens League sponsored commemorative services at Arlington National Cemetery to mark the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II.

The solemn and impressive program consisted of four separate, yet interrelated, functions—each meaningful and significant in its own way.

The first was the formal rites, originally slated for the grove, in the flagpole area adjacent to the Tomb of the Unknowns, which had to be held indoors in the Fort Myer Chapel because of the all-day rain. Here, spoken tributes were paid to American soldiers of Japanese ancestry, living and dead, who served in World War II to earn for themselves and others of Japanese ancestry the right to be accepted and treated as loyal and worthy citizens.

The second was the presentation by the national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, or the JACL, as many of us on the west coast call it, of the floral tribute to all of America's war dead in the Army standard honor wreath ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns. As General Devers remarked in his tribute, the "American soldier known but to God" of World War II might well be an American of Japanese ancestry.

The third was the wreath ceremony at the Masthead of the Battleship *Maine* Monument, where Mrs. Nawa Munemori, a naturalized citizen and the mother of the only Nisei Congressional Medal of Honor winner in World War II, paid floral recognition to the 7 Japanese who are remembered among the 144 officers and men who died when this U.S. battleship was sunk in Havana Harbor, Cuba, in April 1898. These seven Japanese are the first known of their ancestry to have died in the defense of our country's freedom and ideals. And their death more than half a century ago serves to remind us of how long those of the Japanese race have served our Nation well in time of peril and crisis.

It may also be appropriate at this time to recall that Mrs. Munemori and thousands of other Gold Star parents of Japanese ancestry, and others of

Japanese nationality lawfully admitted to this country for permanent residence, could not become naturalized citizens of our country until after her son was awarded the nation's highest decoration for valor posthumously, and thousands of other Japanese American GI's fought, and many died, in World War II to prove that good citizenship, like Americanism, is not a matter of race or ancestry but of the mind and the heart. The privilege of becoming naturalized citizens, incidentally, was not extended to those of the Japanese race until 1952, with the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of that year.

The fourth and final event was the visitations to the individual graves of the 21 American soldiers of Japanese ancestry, representative of the more than 600 Japanese Americans who were killed in action in World War II, who lie in hallowed ground in honored glory in the National Cemetery at Arlington. Twenty of those who are interred at Arlington were killed in action with the 442d Regimental Combat Team. The other served in the Pacific, in military intelligence, against the then Japanese enemy.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SERVICES

The significance of these services, not only to the Nisei, or Japanese Americans, but also to all Americans everywhere and to people of good will throughout the world, and the eloquence of the speakers who paid deserved tribute to the Japanese Americans who served in our Armed Forces in World War II, so impressed a number of my colleagues and me from both the House and the Senate that it was decided that we should relate them to the Congress and the citizens of our country, as well as to the peoples of all nations of earth, in order that they may better understand, through living example, what democracy in action truly means.

As a native-born Californian, I number many Americans of Japanese ancestry among my friends and associates, for there are more Nisei in my State of California than in any other except Hawaii. As one who served in the California State Legislature, and subsequently as the executive secretary of the California Division of Fish and Game, I learned of their problems prior to my election to Congress. In the 19 years of my service in the House, I am proud to have participated in the enactment of many corrective and remedial statutes of benefit to those of Japanese ancestry. The JACL and its able Washington representative Mike Masaoka have been the effective advocates of most such legislation.

And, since the primary reason usually advanced for such justified and meritorious legislation was that it would help the Nisei, who had earned on the battlefields of Europe and in the island-hopping invasions of the Pacific Islands and the jungles, mountains, and deserts of the Asia mainland the heartfelt appreciation and respect of their fellow Americans both in and out of uniform, I was very much aware of the deep significance of these services to our fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry.

Beyond this, as an American who had not been forced to undergo the indignities, sufferings, and sacrifices that our Japanese American citizens were called upon to bear as a part of their unique and unprecedented burdens of war, I can understand what has happened to these victims of wartime prejudice as an example of democracy in action—able to correct its mistakes and even its abuses.

Finally, as a Member of Congress and of the Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I can appreciate the implications and impact of the status which Nisei enjoy in our country today in terms of both international good will and human relationships.

Perhaps the reasons for these commemorative services can best be summarized in JACL's national slogan and challenge—"For better Americans in a greater America"—for Japanese Americans who served in World War II proved themselves to be better Americans under the most difficult of circumstances and helped to make possible this greater America that may well be mankind's last best hope for peace and freedom in this nuclear, space age into which we have moved.

In this connection, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the editorial entitled "Americans All," which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, June 2, 1963, and which places into historic perspective the meaning of these commemorative services. I ask that this editorial be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

AMERICANS ALL

Ceremonies in honor of Americans of Japanese ancestry who fought with valor in World War II will be held today in Arlington National Cemetery under the sponsorship of the Japanese American Citizens League. They will pay tribute in particular to that most decorated military unit in American history, the 442d Regiment, activated just 20 years ago and made up of Nisei who volunteered for war service. And they will recall, inevitably, the tragic exclusion of Japanese Americans from the west coast of the United States and their internment for the war's duration in relocation centers.

No single act of hysteria has placed a greater blot upon the American tradition of respect for civil liberty than the evacuation of all persons of Japanese descent, American citizens included, from California, Oregon, and Washington in the days following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Yet two redeeming developments grew out of that piece of folly. One was the compassionate and considerate administration of the War Relocation Centers by the War Relocation Authority under its wartime director, Dillon S. Myer. The other was the eventual integration of the Japanese Americans into the national community as a consequence of their removal from the coast.

A great many salutary changes have taken place regarding Japanese Americans in the past two decades. They are now trusted and respected members of the American community, welcomed as residents in all parts of the country instead of being confined in large part, as they used to be, to the west coast. Some 500 national, State and local laws once directed against them have been repealed. The Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 has been stricken from the statute books, and naturalization of immigrants from Japan is now permitted. Hawaii, with almost a third of its population of Japanese

ancestry, has become one of the States of the Union.

No doubt the heroism of the 442d Regiment contributed much to this transformation. No doubt the patience and the unwavering loyalty of the Nisei was a significant factor. It seems fair to say, however, that the change is also a reflection of basic American devotion to democratic and libertarian principles momentarily forgotten but never really forsaken. There should be room for rejoicing as well as for sorrow in today's observance at Arlington Cemetery.

To my mind, it was most appropriate and remindful that the formal services in the Fort Myer Chapel opened with the invocation by a Protestant and an Army chaplain, Capt. Edward M. Mueller, Jr., post chaplain of Fort McNair, one of the oldest Army posts in the country, having been activated in 1791, just after our Nation had won its independence, and closed with the benediction by a Buddhist minister, the Reverend Shojo Honda.

Although many Buddhist Americans of Japanese ancestry served in World War II, there were only Christian chaplains available to serve their spiritual needs. That a Buddhist minister pronounced the benediction was a forceful reminder that one of the basic tenets on which our country is founded is religious freedom. It also helped to recall that men of all faiths and creeds fought and died to reaffirm that religion does not determine an American's loyalty and patriotism.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

After the invocation and the playing of the National Anthem, a telegram from the President of the United States was read to the more than 300 who were assembled in the chapel in spite of the heavy downpour:

It is with pleasure that I extend warm greetings to the Japanese American community and their guests. I am delighted to convey these words through Mr. Mike Masaoka.

As Americans of Japanese descent, you may well be proud of your historic heritage and the many contributions made by your countrymen.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the formation of an organization that history has recorded as one of the most decorated units ever to serve the cause of freedom and our country. Our Nation has cause to be proud of the men who composed the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

At the same time, we must also remember that Japanese Americans too served with equal honor and distinction in the Pacific.

With every good wish for successful commemorative services and for continuing progress in the important work you are doing.

After reading the telegram from the President, Chairman of the Services Mike Masaoka explained that these services were dedicated—

to Americans of Japanese ancestry who, though questioned as to their loyalty and mistreated in World War II, served with honor and gallantry in every branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, in every major campaign of that farflung war, to prove—beyond all doubt—for all time to come, that Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.

Twenty years ago—

Masaoka declared—

Americans of Japanese ancestry were suspect citizens of the land of their own birth, even unwanted Americans. And yet, in spite of a mass and arbitrary military evacuation unprecedented in our history, in which 110,000 Americans with Japanese faces were herded into what were described as war relocation camps, thousands of these interned Americans demanded of the Army that had removed them and of the Government that had questioned their loyalty the right to fight, and if necessary to die, for our country.

Two decades ago this year, then President Franklin D. Roosevelt granted them their desire, and later in the same year Selective Service was reopened to all qualified Nisei without restriction.

But the heartwarming memory is that of the hundreds of Americans of Japanese ancestry volunteering for active combat and intelligence duty from out of the war relocation camps into which they had been confined and marching out to join in the battle against the German and Japanese enemies from behind the watchtowers and barbed wire fences, guarded by military police wearing the same uniform for which they had volunteered.

In Hawaii, though Japanese Americans there had not been as badly mistreated as those on the continental mainland, they too had to suffer humiliation, indignity, and discrimination. But, when the call for volunteers came from the President, they were so enthusiastic that more than 10,000 responded in less than a week, thereby forcing the Army to revise upwards its plans for inducting Hawaiian Nisei, from about 1,500 to almost 3,000.

Because these Japanese Americans served so well in every theater of operations, we Americans of Japanese ancestry today are the beneficiaries of their heroic actions and sacrifices. We live as shining examples of democracy in action, as respected and accepted Americans, entitled to all of the privileges, obligations, and opportunities of our way of life.

We are here met in these commemorative services to pay honor and tribute to them, the Japanese Americans who by their service in World War II, made possible this gathering this afternoon.

GOLD STAR PARENTS INTRODUCED

Among the Gold Star parents who were introduced were Mrs. Nawa Munemori, of Los Angeles, whose son, as mentioned previously, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously—for deliberately diving on an unexploded hand grenade and smothering its explosion with his own body, allowing himself to be killed that other Americans might live to fight another day.

Mr. and Mrs. B. Nagato, also of Los Angeles, whose son Private First Class Fumitake was one of the first two heroes of the 442d to be interred in Arlington.

Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, of Pocatello, Idaho, whose two sons, Private Raito and Sergeant Wataru sleep side by side in Arlington.

Mr. H. Nagano, of Blackfoot, Idaho, whose son Private Hiroshi is also interred here in Arlington; and three Gold Star mothers who came by bus from Seabrook, N.J., to participate in the services—Mrs. Riyo Mukai, Mrs. Mune Minakata, and Mrs. Misaye Fujiki.

Among representatives of the veterans organizations present were Togo Nakagawa, former executive secretary of the 442d Veterans Club of Honolulu, representing the Japanese American veterans of Hawaii; Jun Yamamoto of the Nisei Memorial VFW Post 9938 of Los Angeles;

Harry Takagi, former president of the Seattle Nisei Veterans Association; James Kono of the 442d Association of New York; Joe Kadowaki representing the Nisei veterans of Cleveland; Frank Kelly, representing the National Headquarters of the American Legion; and Norman Jones, representing the National Veterans of Foreign Wars Headquarters.

Among the many honored guests were two who have special knowledge of the Japanese American GI in the Pacific, retired Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, General MacArthur's Chief of Staff for Intelligence from 1941 to 1951, and former Ambassador William J. Sebald, political adviser to General MacArthur following the surrender of Japan and the Allied occupation of that land.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 75]

Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Powell
Ayres	Garmatz	Rivers, S.C.
Baker	Grabowski	Roosevelt
Baring	Green, Oreg.	St. George
Barry	Gubser	St. Germain
Bray	Hardy	Senner
Brock	Harris	Sheppard
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Sibal
Buckley	Hemphill	Smith, Calif.
Cahill	Hoffman	Smith, Va.
Celler	Hollifield	Springer
Chelf	Jarman	Staeble
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Clausen	Kilburn	Teague, Calif.
Cohelan	Kirwan	Thompson, La.
Conte	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Curtin	Lankford	Trimble
Davis, Tenn.	Lipscomb	Utt
Dawson	Long, Md.	Van Pelt
Dent	Martin, Calif.	Vinson
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Wharton
Dorn	Miller, N.Y.	Whitten
Farbstein	Nelsen	Williams
Fogarty	Olson, Minn.	Willis
Forrester	Ostertag	Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TRIBUTES TO JAPANESE AMERICAN MILITARY SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor for me to join in paying tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so proudly and so well in our Armed Forces in World War II.

Before the 1942 mass evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific Coast, there were few Japanese Americans in our State of Nebraska.

Most of these resided in the western section of our State and were engaged in agriculture.

It is a source of particular pride, therefore, that I may point to S. Sgt. Ben Kuroki, of Hershey, Nebr., who is one of the more famous Japanese American war heroes of World War II. He volunteered for the Air Force the day after Pearl Harbor, and through some quirk in administration was accepted, even though at that time the Army Air Force was supposedly closed to those of Japanese descent. He was the first Japanese American to serve under enemy fire, being a tail gunner on Air Force bombers in raids in North Africa and subsequently in Europe. He flew two full tours in a Liberator bomber, including the famous bomber raid on the Ploesti oilfields in Rumania. After 30 combat missions, though eligible for reassignment to non-combat duty, he insisted upon and received an assignment in the Pacific, where he participated in the B-29 raids over the Japanese home islands. Altogether, he flew 58 combat missions in two theaters, earning thereby three Distinguished Flying Crosses and the coveted Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters. Few Americans regardless of ancestry had a more distinguished record in World War II. Incidentally, four Kuroki brothers in all served in World War II.

After his unprecedented flying record, he returned to the States, where he undertook, in his own words, "a mission against prejudice at home." His activities during and after the war are chronicled in a book called the "Boy From Nebraska," written by Ralph G. Martin, a combat correspondent for the Stars and Stripes, and with a special foreword by famed cartoonist Bill Mauldin.

Among those who participated in the commemorative services on June 2 was K. Patrick Okura, the national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, who is now a resident of Omaha. Pat, as we call him, and his wife Lily, are outstanding citizens of our community. Pat had three brothers who served in World War II—a brother, Private First-Class Susumu was killed while in action with the 442d; another brother, Sergeant Jimmie, served in military intelligence in the Pacific; and still another brother, Technical Sergeant Tsuyoshi served in the Medical Corps.

Pat, who delivered the tribute of his organization and laid the organizational wreath at the Tomb of the Unknowns, is the mental health planning executive of the community services division of the Nebraska Psychiatric Institute. Before his present responsibility, he was the chief juvenile probation officer for Douglas County. Prior to that, the late, beloved Father Flanagan at Boys' Town brought him out from Los Angeles after the evacuation to serve as psychologist and casework supervisor, a post which he held for 16 years. Before the evacuation, he was with the Los Angeles County Department of Charities. For 6 years he served on the Governor's Committee for Youth in Nebraska, and among other elected offices, he served as president of the Nebraska Welfare Association.

His wife, Lily, is a personality in her own right, not only among Japanese Americans but also in the general community. She is the administrator of the Meyer Therapy Center for Children in Omaha. She has just been elected and installed as the Nebraska State president of Altrusa, the international professional businesswomen's society. Recently, she was the international vice president of the International Secretaries Association. She has just retired from a post once held by her husband Pat, that of president of the Nebraska Welfare Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute paid to Japanese Americans who served in World War II by K. Patrick Okura, of Omaha, as national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

(By K. Patrick Okura, national president)

The Japanese American Citizens League is highly honored to sponsor this commemorative "Services in the Grove" here on the hallowed grounds of the Arlington National Cemetery to honor all of America's war dead and particularly the Unknown Soldier of World War II and more especially all Japanese Americans who served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

Just 20 short years ago, Americans of Japanese ancestry were eyed with suspicion by our fellow Americans. The majority of us were confined in war relocation centers following the mass evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast.

Today Americans of Japanese ancestry enjoy the respect and full acceptance of our fellow men and are fulfilling the obligations and responsibilities as full fledged citizens of the United States.

The unswerving devotion of the Nisei to their country and their faith in it when our country did not have faith in them has contributed most to the achievement of this goal.

Despite the hate and hysteria and the extreme hostility directed to all individuals of Japanese ancestry, especially on the west coast, thousands of Americans of Japanese ancestry wrote to the President of the United States and the War Department, demanding the right to serve our country against our enemies.

The JACL joined with other organizations in urging the President and the War Department, to authorize such service. Our leaders had the wisdom and foresight to recognize that our loyalty to the United States would continue to be raised unless our loyalty was demonstrated beyond all doubt and question on the battlefields against the enemies of our Nation even though the enemy might be of our own ancestry.

The decision of the War Department in January of 1943, to accept qualified Japanese Americans on a volunteer basis was followed by the organization of a special unit of the Army in which they could share in the fight against the enemy.

The inherent right of every faithful citizen, regardless of ancestry, to bear arms was followed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's statement which I quote, "No loyal citizen of the United States should be denied the democratic right to exercise the responsibilities of his citizenship, regardless of ancestry. The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter of the mind

and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."

The war record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, the 100th Infantry Battalion, Military Intelligence Service, and those who served in the Pacific theater is a matter of record of which we are justly and extremely proud. It is a known fact that those who served, not only fought and won over the enemy, but also fought prejudice and bigotry, and won.

It can be truly said that our Nisei war dead did not die in vain. The splendid respect and full acceptance of Americans of Japanese ancestry today can be credited without doubt to the unparalleled record of loyalty and gallantry of our Nisei war heroes. To those heroes who made the supreme sacrifice, and to the thousands of Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so heroically in World War II, we owe our humble thanks and gratitude. The Japanese American Citizens League takes this occasion to pay our tribute and homage by conducting this "Services in the Grove" here at Arlington National Cemetery.

We ask God's help in keeping alive the hope and belief that there was purpose and meaning in the cause for which our Japanese American soldiers died in World War II. If we truly believe this, then their sacrifices were not in vain.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, as one who was most impressed by the commemorative services sponsored by the Japanese American Citizens League at Arlington National Cemetery on June 2, 1963, paying honor to Japanese Americans who served in World War II, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join in these tributes today.

As another native Californian, I grew up with and went to school with many Americans of Japanese ancestry. Today, I count among my friends and supporters many Nisei, including Municipal Court Judge Wayne Kanemoto, a decorated Japanese American veteran of World War II.

In Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, which I have the honor to represent here in the House of Representatives, there are many outstanding Nisei in almost every field of human endeavor. For almost the past century, they and their parents have contributed much to their respective communities, particularly in agriculture and horticulture in the prewar days.

When, for reasons which now seem completely unreasonable and unjustified, these Japanese Americans were evacuated from their homes and associations on the west coast in the spring and summer of 1942, it was fortunate not only for the evacuee Japanese Americans but also for our country that there was a Director in charge of the War Relocation Authority who had the understanding, compassion, and humanity of Dillon S. Myer.

As Mike Masaoka, who, as the chairman of the commemorative services and was the national secretary and field executive of the Japanese American Citizens League during the evacuation and early relocation days prior to his volunteering for service with the 442d Regimental Combat Team, perhaps knows better than any other Japanese American what

the administration of that wartime agency meant to the evacuee population, declared in introducing Mr. Myer at the Sunday services:

Had it not been for the democratic, humane, and courageous direction of the War Relocation Authority, I doubt very much that many Japanese American evacuees would have thought enough about America to volunteer for combat duty with the U.S. Army after their experiences with the military.

Mr. Myer was also among the very few high in Government in those days who from the very beginning insisted upon giving the evacuee Nisei the opportunity to serve in our country's Armed Forces. He early realized that only a dramatic record of heroism in battle could turn the tide against the racists and the bigots who had advocated successfully the evacuation and then urged their permanent exclusion from the Pacific coast. He had faith and confidence in the inherent Americanism of the Japanese American. Today, his faith and confidence stand vindicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute to Japanese Americans who served in World War II, by Dillon S. Myer, wartime Director of the War Relocation Authority, be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE NISEI IN WORLD WAR II MILITARY SERVICE

(By Dillon S. Myer, Arlington National Cemetery, June 2, 1963)

I am proud to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the Nisei, who were in the military service in World War II, on this 20th anniversary of their participation in the war.

As most of you know, I felt very deeply about their need and right to participate. First of all they deserved the same opportunity as other Americans to serve their country in the military forces. Secondly, in their situation they had a real need to prove to the rest of the United States and to the world that "Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart" and not a matter of race or ancestry."

There were in this country many unscrupulous or misguided self-styled patriots who would accept no other proof of loyalty and Americanism; other than the kind of brilliant and heroic service that was displayed by the members of the 100th Battalion, the 442d Combat Team, the language school graduates in the Pacific, and others. I speak as one who had the opportunity to learn of the breadth and depth of the fear, hatred, distrust, and economic interest that existed in many areas among thoughtless, ignorant, and misled people who were continually stirred by a few unscrupulous so-called patriotic groups and individuals.

The military service and the records of Nisei heroism, which could be dramatically publicized, was essential to disprove the results of 40 years of the "yellow peril" campaign waged by the Sons of the Golden West, the California Legion, and related groups.

The relocation of the 110,000 evacuees from the west coast might have been accomplished after a fashion without the help of the Nisei in uniform but there is a real doubt about it. In any case the military exploits made the relocation job possible in some areas and made it much easier everywhere. The help of Lieutenant Grandstaff and other officers, who had been asso-

ciated with the 442d Combat Team, were loaned by the War Department, to go to Placerville, Fresno, and many other places up and down the big valley of California and the west coast, to tell them of the exploits and heroism of the Nisei in uniform, created an atmosphere of friendship and good will on the part of many good people toward evacuee returnees. This could not have been possible otherwise.

The most of you remember how the Hood River American Legion Post was responsible for the removal of the name of Sgt. Frank Hachiya from an honor roll plaque because he was of Japanese ancestry even though he received the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously. At a meeting in the spring of 1945 which I attended, this same group came with 15 or 20 legionnaires who were fathers of boys in the military service. Some of these had lost sons in the Pacific. The leader of this group after introducing them asked for a vote on whether they wanted the Japanese to return to Hood River. When they were reminded that there were many Issei fathers and mothers in relocation centers who had received the same kind of War Department messages as some of them had received, announcing the loss of a son in the service, and that these parents had made even greater sacrifices because of having been evacuated, there was no vote.

These sacrifices of the Issei fathers and mothers and the excellent record of the Nisei in the service in both the Pacific and European theaters made it possible to lick the campaign of the racists and to disprove the propaganda of the "yellow peril" campaign. Thanks to those valiant soldiers being honored here today, discrimination has been largely eliminated by the revision of the immigration statutes and by action of the courts and State legislative bodies.

It took the kind of heroism and dramatic action displayed by the Nisei in uniform to awaken the American conscience and to stir people of good will everywhere into taking the necessary action to erase the results of the racists' campaigns.

Not only the Americans of Japanese ancestry but everyone in the United States owes to the Nisei in uniform in World War II a great debt of gratitude.

I personally wish to express my gratitude to all of them for the sacrifices and the wonderful demonstration of real patriotism and heroism which they have exhibited and which has been so helpful to so many.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to join in paying tribute to Japanese Americans who served with such honor and valor in World War II.

It may come as a surprise to most but my understanding is that probably more Americans of Japanese ancestry volunteered for military duty, for both the 442d Regimental Combat Team and military intelligence in the Pacific, from the so-called Minidoka Relocation Center at Hunt, Idaho, than from any of the nine other relocation camps where the evacuee Japanese Americans had been sent and confined in 1942. Most of these evacuees originally resided in western Washington and Oregon.

Moreover, on a per capita basis, my understanding is that more Japanese Americans who were not restricted to relocation camps volunteered for active combat duty in World War II from Idaho than from any other State, except possibly for the then territory of Hawaii.

Indeed, of the 21 Japanese American war heroes interred here at Arlington National Cemetery, 4 are from Idaho—Private Raito and Sgt. Wataru Nakashima, Pfc. Kiyoshi Murakami, and Pvt. Hiroshi Nagano.

In Emmett, a farming community in my district, they still talk about the quasi-public funeral services held for the Hosoda brothers who were killed in action with the 442d in Europe. The city government, the schools, the banks, and the shops and stores all closed up and the entire citizenry gathered together to honor these two Japanese Americans who had volunteered for combat even though they were eligible for deferment because of their valuable work. The two brothers did not come back, but the community is the richer because of their sacrifices.

As a matter of fact, perhaps the greatest single reason that the voters of my State last November went to the polls and overwhelmingly repealed a constitutional prohibition against naturalized Mongolians "not born in this country," and especially the Japanese parents of our World War II servicemen, voting, serving on juries, or holding public offices, is the outstanding record compiled by the sons of these then ineligible Japanese on overseas battlefields.

Incidentally, Ted Kazuo Yamashita, son of Mr. and Mrs. Masao Yamashita, of Caldwell, Idaho, has just graduated in the upper third of his class at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Now a second lieutenant, he was nominated for West Point by Senator FRANK CHURCH, of my State, and is the first Japanese American in Idaho to be appointed to the Military Academy. Ted has decided to be an infantryman, so he will soon be assigned to Fort Benning, Ga., where we expect that he will continue the outstanding tradition of the Japanese American combat infantryman.

Mr. Speaker, it was most appropriate, to my way of thinking, that retired four-star Gen. Jacob L. Devers, now chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, should have delivered the principal tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II. As one of our top field commanders in the European theater, he was intimately connected with the 442d Regimental Combat Team, and before that with the 100th Infantry Battalion, the first Japanese American unit to engage the enemy in combat that was later integrated into the 442d as its 1st Battalion.

A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1909, he served in France and Germany with the Field Artillery in World War I. Most of the period between the wars, he served at West Point, first as an instructor in mathematics and later as the graduate manager of athletics. In 1939, he became Chief of Staff of the Panama Canal Department and 2 years later he was promoted to Chief of the Armed Forces. In May 1943, he became commanding general of the U.S. forces in the European theater of operations. It was later as Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in the Mediterranean theater of opera-

tions that the 100th and later the 442d came under his command. Both had their baptism of fire under General Devers, the 100th at Salerno in September 1943 and the 442d at Suvereto in June 1944, both in Italy as a part of the 34th Infantry Division, 5th Army.

When the 442d joined the 36th Infantry Division, 7th Army, in the eastern drive through France toward the German homeland in the fall of 1944, General Devers was the commanding general of the 6th Army Group, of which the 7th was a part. It was during this autumn push that the 442d won its greatest fame in its rescue of the Lost Texas Battalion, in the Vosges Mountains of northeastern France.

In 1948, when he was Chief of the Army Field Forces, he officiated at the ceremonial rites for Pfc. Saburo Tanamachi and Pfc. Fumitake Nagato, when they were interred at Arlington as the first Japanese Americans to be laid to rest here in this hallowed ground of this great national cemetery. This particular ceremony took place 15 years ago almost to the day, June 4, 1948, that he paid another tribute to Japanese Americans who served under his command in World War II.

In 1949, after some 40 years of service, General Devers retired as the Chief of the Army Field Forces, much decorated by our own and foreign governments for his outstanding military career.

As chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, it is his responsibility to oversee American war monuments and cemeteries overseas, a most appropriate honor for a combat general.

At this point, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Gen. Jacob L. Devers' tribute to Japanese American troops who served in World War II, particularly the 442d.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GEN. JACOB L. DEVERS, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, JUNE 2, 1963

Members of the Japanese American Citizens League and friends, I hope Mr. Dillon S. Myer and those speakers who follow will forgive me if I trespass just a mite on their territory in this tribute.

I also welcome the opportunity to pay my respects to, and to express my admiration for two distinguished representatives of our American citizens of Japanese ancestry: Senator DANIEL K. INOUE, who was wounded in Italy and brought home a Distinguished Service Cross, and Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, a Purple Heart veteran of European combat and of the Pacific Military Intelligence Service.

What shall we, who are gathered here today, tell those who sleep in this beautiful and hallowed cemetery and in other resting places around the world?

Twenty years ago many of these men and most of us here—Americans all—were facing the hazards of the battlefields of World War II, while our Japanese American population was facing the doubt of their acceptance by their fellow Americans as full-fledged, loyal, citizens.

At that time, a panicky hysteria had brought about the inhuman treatment of 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry—more

than two-thirds of whom were American-born citizens—by uprooting them from their west coast homes and forcing them into relocation camps in desolate areas of the interior.

This somber picture has been eclipsed by the brilliant record of the courage, stamina, esprit de corps and devotion to our country exhibited in all theaters of the war by American soldiers of Japanese ancestry.

When the War Department, moved by the pleas of thousands of Japanese Americans, anxious to serve their country in this time of trouble, lifted restrictions against their entering military service, they volunteered by the thousands, anxious to prove on the testing ground of battle their devotion, their loyalty and their eagerness to discharge the responsibilities of their rightful citizenship even unto death.

So, 33,300 American citizens of Japanese ancestry, more than half of whom came from the continental United States, saw service in World War II. They called themselves Nisei; their accomplishments have made this name an honored addition to the American vocabulary.

During the course of the war the only organized combat units composed entirely of Japanese Americans were the 100th Infantry Battalion, and the 442d Regimental Combat Team into which the 100th Battalion was later integrated.

Entering combat in Italy on September 29, 1943, as a unit of the 34th Infantry Division of the 5th Army, the 100th Battalion took part in the bitter battles at the Volturno River, on the upper Rapido River, at Cassino and in the breakout from the Anzio beachhead. Its many casualties brought to the battalion the proud nickname of the Purple Heart Battalion.

Arriving also in Italy on June 2, 1944, the 442d Regimental Combat Team entered combat north of Rome on June 26 as a component of the 34th Infantry Division. It participated in the pursuit to, and the heavily contested crossing of, the Arno River, including the capture of Leghorn. On September 2 this combat team was sent to southern France where it entered combat on October 15 as a unit of the 36th Division, 7th Army, engaging in the assault on Bruyeres which was entered after 3 days of bitter fighting. The 7th U.S. Army report on these operations states: "Bruyeres will long be remembered, for it was the most viciously fought-for town we had encountered in our long march against the Germans. The enemy defended it house by house, giving up a yard only when it became so untenable they could no longer hope to hold it."

Perhaps the unit's most well-known exploit was the relief of the "lost" 1st Battalion, 141st Infantry, of the 36th Division which had been cut off by the enemy in the Vosges Mountains. In 3 days of savage fighting, with close combat use of the grenade and bayonet, the Nisei broke through the enemy cordon. In gratitude, the men of the 36th Division launched a drive to have all members of 442d declared "honorary Texans." I personally ordered this unit to the Riviera for rest, recuperation, and to refit, for during the period from October 15 to November 7 this Nisei unit sustained 814 battle casualties.

Returning to Italy early in 1945 the 442d participated in the final campaign of the war as a component of the 92d Infantry Division. Five days of bloody combat in the Massacarrara area smashed this western anchor of the formidable Gothic line which had withstood the Allied assaults for 5 long months. The drive continued on to La Spezia, Genoa, and across the Po Valley.

During its 11 months of combat the 442d suffered 9,480 casualties, including 600 killed in action. This was more than 3 times its original infantry strength. Nearly 9,500 Purple Hearts were awarded to its members,

including oak leaf clusters, some men earning 3 of these.

Included in the more than 18,000 individual decorations awarded were 1 Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, and 600 Silver Stars. On numerous occasions it has been officially stated that the regiment was "the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service." It had more than justified its motto "Go for Broke."

I think back with pride upon the privilege of having these magnificent troops serve under my command.

Although no combat units of Japanese Americans were organized to fight in the Pacific theaters, nearly as many Nisei served there, in the military intelligence service, as served in the European theater. Their contributions to victory were no less dramatic or important. Attached to American and Allied units, they served as interrogators, interpreters, translators, radio announcers, propaganda writers, and cave flushers. It has been well said that "never before in history did an army know so much concerning its enemy, prior to actual engagement, as did the American Army during most of the Pacific campaigns."

Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Burma, Attu, Munda, Tarawa, Peleliu, Saipan, Guam, Iwo Jima, the Philippines, Okinawa, all were scenes of stubborn, bloody, all-out fighting, but this was made easier by the fruitful efforts of Nisei combat intelligence personnel, for they were there. In their eagerness to do their job well, the Nisei often worked so close to the front lines that, to the danger of being killed, or worse still, being captured, by the Japanese, they added the risk of being shot, through mistaken identity, by friendly troops.

Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell of Burma fame, noted for pithy and often pungent statements, summed it all up: "The Nisei bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood. We cannot allow a single injury to be done them without defeating the purposes for which they fought."

Our Japanese American war heroes proved their devotion to the United States of America and its principles of freedom and democracy. Together with their fellow Nisei in the ranks of civilian America whose steadfast demonstration of patriotism and dedicated discharge of their responsibilities as citizens, they paved the way for those of similar ancestry to enjoy to the full the privileges, opportunities and dignity of the American way of life. Theirs is an experience—a vital lesson here which should be used in solving some of our immediate problems.

It is most fitting that this commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the rescinding of the restrictions on military service by American citizens of Japanese ancestry is being held today in close proximity to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War II, who could, himself, have well been a Nisei.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California, the Honorable EDWARD R. ROYBAL.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was reared in the Boyle Heights area of the city of Los Angeles and had as my childhood playmates, many youngsters of Japanese ancestry. We grew to adulthood together and I remember seeing them in their valley of tears, forced to leave their community, abandon their homes, and sell their possessions for whatever they could get, before being herded to what we call a relocation camp.

Later, the whole Nation became aware of the fact that these same evacuees volunteered to fight for their country,

the United States of America, and the subsequent outstanding record established by the now famous 442d Japanese American combat team.

Recently I was impressed with the many speeches given in tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II at the commemorative services held here in Washington. I must confess that some of the information provided by my friend, Judge John F. Aiso, concerning the use of Japanese American soldiers in military intelligence came as a surprise.

Like most Americans, I am rather familiar with the "go for broke" exploits of the 442d Japanese American combat team. But, I knew very little about the extensive use of Japanese American linguists in the Pacific war against the Japanese enemy.

In this connection, it may be appropriate that Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, in his book entitled "MacArthur 1941-1951," had this to say regarding the significance of this service:

Several FBI-trained operatives of Japanese ancestry, Nisei, had been imported from Hawaii in the prewar months to keep the Japanese population in the Philippines under discreet surveillance. Those men later rendered most important services on Bataan in the interrogation of prisoners of war, in the translation of captured documents, and as counterintelligence agents. Their use called attention to the linguistic potentialities of the American Nisei; this was the modest beginning of the Allied Translator and Interpreter Service.

Fundamental to intelligence, however, was the enormously difficult problem of dealing with the complicated Japanese language. Few Americans could speak it, much less read its forbidding alphabet and script. Early in the war, according to the MacArthur records, "the Japanese had found . . . they could label their minefields, carry personal diaries, use their spoken language freely, and even handle military documents with little regard for security."

But MacArthur, unlike the panicky Californian authorities who insisted on herding second-generation Japanese Americans (the Nisei) into concentration camps, had complete confidence in the Nisei. His G-2 employed hundreds of second-generation Japanese from Hawaii and California in linguist detachments, to be sent into the field with combat forces. ATIS intelligence teams accompanied the troops in all initial landing operations. Captured maps and orders processed by ATIS revealed enemy strength and dispositions and plans of attack. Diaries contained excellent clues to the psychology and the state of morale of the Japanese troops. Other documents indicated the enemy's problems of food and supply, his order of battle, the effect of our air attacks, his relations with natives, the relative effectiveness of Allied and Japanese weapons. Spot interrogations of prisoners taken in battle were at times of such importance that they caused a shift in Allied plans of attack."

As General MacArthur's Chief of Staff for Intelligence from the attack on the Philippines through to the Korean War, General Willoughby probably knows more about the tremendous contributions which they made to victory than any other single person. He reports in an official memorandum:

We used them even on Bataan. They collected information on the battlefield, they shared death in battle, and when one of them was captured his fate was a terrible one. In

all, they handled between 2 and 3 million documents. The information received through their skills proved invaluable to our battle forces.

Col. Sidney F. Mashbir, who commanded ATIS, has this summation to make of the Japanese American contribution to victory in the Pacific:

Had it not been for the loyalty, fidelity, patriotism, and ability of these American Nisei, that part of the war in the Pacific which was dependent upon intelligence gleaned from captured documents and prisoners of war would have been a far more hazardous, long-drawn-out affair.

At a highly conservative estimate, thousands of American lives were preserved and millions of dollars in material were saved as a result of their contribution to the war effort.

Speaking in tribute to these Japanese Americans who served in the Pacific at the commemorative services was Judge Aiso, of the superior court of Los Angeles. One of our most distinguished jurists, he was the first Japanese American on the continental mainland to be appointed to the bench, being named to the municipal court by the then Governor of California, now the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren. He was later promoted to the superior court by then Gov. Goodwin Knight.

He was drafted into the Army as a private and was relieved from active duty as a lieutenant colonel. He is now a colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the U.S. Army Reserve, with a mobilization designation as chairman of the International Law Division of Judge Advocate General's Corps.

During the war he was the head instructor of the Military Intelligence Service Language School at the Presidio in San Francisco; thereafter, following the mass evacuation of 1942, he was the director of academic training of the Japanese language schools at Camp Savage and at Fort Snelling, both in Minnesota. As an intelligence officer in occupied Japan, he was the assistant section chief of the civil intelligence section of General Headquarters, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, and the executive assistant to Major General Willoughby, Chief of Staff for Intelligence for General MacArthur.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute of Judge Aiso be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TRIBUTE TO NISEI IN G-2

(By Judge John F. Aiso, Arlington National Cemetery, June 2, 1963)

Loyalty and obligation to serve ones' country in time of war and its proper place in the scale of human values, opinions of the learned Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court remind us, are not simple concepts or notions. Moral courage with its sophistication too has its place in times of national crises as President Kennedy so ably depicts in his "Profiles of Courage." Fortunately for me, my assigned mission today is limited to paying tribute to the Nisei of G-2, permitting me to leave the depiction of the total picture of loyalty and courage in time of war to those to whom providence has granted op-

portunities of the broader perspective and the genius of greater artistry.

These homespun words are meant for all Nisei who participated in military intelligence activities during World War II. Nisei in G-2 includes the living as well as the honored dead. It includes those who served as War Department civilians as well as those in uniform. Deemed too valuable for non-commissioned officer grade, but prohibited by War Department edict from being commissioned only because of racial ancestry until V-J Day was within concrete grasp, civilian status was for convenience of Government. And Nisei WAC's, too, were in G-2.

Nisei participation in G-2 service commenced as early as April 1941. It continues in some form to this date although many military intelligence activities have been transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency.

Linguistic combat intelligence work began on Pearl Harbor Day and at Bataan and Corregidor. The Nisei member of the beach patrol which captured the first Japanese prisoner of war—the sublieutenant that spied on Pearl Harbor from his one-man submarine—participated in his interrogation on the evening of December 7, 1941. And Sgt. Arthur S. Komori, of Hawaii, served as combat linguist for General Wainwright until evacuated to Australia on General MacArthur's personal order.

As fast as graduates could be poured out of the Military Intelligence Service Language School, their activities extended into every major theater of operations, viz.: North American, Asiatic-Pacific, CBI, and ETO. Some stormed the beaches with the second- and third-wave leathernecks and doughboys as they island-hopped across the Pacific from Kwajalein and Tarawa to Okinawa. Although not as large in total numbers or percentage as their compatriots of the 442d Combat Team, a representative cross-section of MIS (Military Intelligence Service) boys were killed in action, starting with Sgt. Frank Hachiya of Hood River, Oreg., on Leyte and terminating with the 12 from Hawaii on the day before V-J Day in Okinawa. One language team attached to GHQ SHAEPF intercepted and monitored the communications to and from the High Imperial Headquarters in Tokyo and General Oshima stationed in Berlin. Others worked out of ATIS, Arlington Hall, the Army Map Service, the OWI, and the Military Intelligence Service Language and its satellite on the University of Michigan campus. A vast cross-section took part in transplanting the concepts of democracy and nurturing its growth in occupied Japan.

But whatever their specific mission and wherever they were, their common motivation was a burning desire to prove that a Nisei's belief in and devotion to the ideas of freedom and American institutions were stronger than the fortuitous ties of racial affinity. His self-assigned overall mission was to prove for all time to come that judging one's loyalty even in time of war on the basis of racial affinity and sympathetic affiliation alone was and is wrong, notwithstanding the imprimatur of the Hiramabashi and Korematsu decisions to the contrary. And what better proof could he offer than to actively wage war directly against Japan.

This determination to fight against kith and kin called forth the high qualities of intellectual honesty and moral courage for those best qualified for G-2 service were those whose sentimental heartstrings for relatives and close friends tugged the strongest.

The vast majority of Nisei in G-2, however, had known only their birthplace America. They had never seen Japan. Only 3 percent of those in the Army in 1941 were found to possess a qualified command of the Japanese language.

But fortunately there was a nucleus of Nisei who had in the face of many adversities

steeped themselves in the language, history, and culture of both nations. He was the older Nisei who had accepted the challenge of assimilation and Americanization seriously and yet found that assimilation does not mean the abject surrender of pride of racial ancestry. To him the adventure of being a Nisei in 20th-century America was a role and a sacred trust bestowed upon him by decision of his Creator. With over 20 years of close infighting against prejudice and discrimination heaped upon him by chauvinistic elements in both the United States and Japan, he was by 1941 already a mentally and morally battle-conditioned veteran.

Even the intellectual skills and judgments that he proffered to the arsenal of democracy had been wrought in tears and with heartaches. He had been taunted by some misguided American public school authorities that to study the Japanese language was ipso facto, un-American and disloyal. He had found schools in Japan slammed shut against him by petty bureaucrats yelling that Japanese government schools were for loyal subjects of the Emperor only and not for foreign-born sons of emigrants.

But this American of Japanese ancestry had learned his lessons well. His American education had endowed him with the faculty of thinking rationally. He had become imbued with the tradition born of the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and World War I that Americans don't hesitate to bear arms against blood relatives when freedom and moral principles are at stake. He had "talked to Lincoln" as often as he prayed to his God, because the rail-splitter knew what it was like to be born and raised in a rural shack as so many of the older Nisei were. It was Lincoln who assured him that he had a future in America, because our Nation was dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. And while not exactly a de Tocqueville or a Bryce, he had delved deeper than the average Japanese in Japan for the true meaning of "Bushido." From Dr. Nitobe's writings and from heart-to-heart talks with the truly great characters in civilian and military circles in Japan, he had learned that to a true "bushi" (Japanese knight), blood and sentimental ties were of secondary consideration only when issues of "giri" (duty), "meiyo" (honor), and "on" (gratitude) were laid on the line.

The quiet dedication, therefore, of the Nisei in G-2 to help crush a militaristically conditioned, controlled, and oriented Japan was consistent and consonant with the lofty traditions of both American and Japanese patriots in their finest moments. History will prove as time goes on that their's was a contribution which will transcend narrow national demarcations.

More specifically the Armed Forces Language School, now located at the Presidio of Monterey in California, is their tangible contribution to our national defense. But the reverberations of their intangible contributions will reach even further. In teaching his Caucasian comrades in arms the mastery of the Japanese language, he tore asunder the mythical veil of the inscrutable oriental mind; he demonstrated that east is not east and west is not west when it comes to the longings and aspiration of mankind. In waging a cold war which seeks the capture of men's hearts and minds, knowledge and command of the enemy's language are just as vital as nuclear weapons. And like the atom, language can be employed not only in waging wars, but also in our quest for world peace.

Written words are but signs and symbols of thoughts and the spoken tongue is the medium of exchange in the free commerce of ideas and emotions. Translation and interpretation are arts. They are effective only when there is spontaneous selection and correlation between adherence to dic-

tionary equivalents and the employment of an idiom evoking the precise counterpart idea or emotional reaction. Thus thorough knowledge of the foreigner's psychological make-up, his racial characteristics, and historical background and traditions are not only essential but indispensable. So too is a recondite appreciation of his individual and collective hopes and fears.

When mastery of foreign language command as thus defined becomes a commonplace in every American home, then and then only will the mask of inscrutability be removed from the faces of our potential enemies. Then and then only will international mistrusts be dissolved and international understanding truly achieved.

For showing us the feasibility and significance of this high adventure we say today, "Thank you, Nisei in G-2."

With your foreign language command, you helped crush a militarist Japan, nurture the dignity of the individual in a democratic peace-loving Japan, and make American-Japanese amity a more genuine reality.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as most Members are aware, there are more Americans of Japanese ancestry in the city of Los Angeles than in any other American city except Honolulu. About a third of all Nisei in the U.S. mainland reside in Los Angeles County. It is easy to understand, therefore, why we take such pride in our Japanese Americans who served so valiantly in both Europe and in the Pacific. We are particularly proud that Mrs. Nawa Munemori, of Los Angeles, whose son, Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori, won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously while with the 442d, was able to attend these services and that she was designated to lay a wreath at the monument to the Battleship *Maine*, in Arlington National Cemetery, on behalf of all Japanese Gold Star mothers.

At least 4 of the 21 Japanese American war heroes who lie in honored glory here in Arlington were born in California. They are Pvt. Ben Frank Masaoka, Pfc. Roy T. Morihiro, Pfc. Fumitake Nagato, and Pfc. Lloyd Mitsuru Onoye.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 2, I was privileged to attend memorial services at Arlington Cemetery for our fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry who have died in defense of their native America.

I was impressed especially on this occasion by the eloquence of the first Nisei elected to Congress—the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUE, now representing Hawaii in the U.S. Senate. Mr. INOUE lost his right arm in action as a member of our celebrated 442d Regimental Combat Team, the all-Nisei fighting unit whose men consummated with their blood the ideals of which Senator INOUE spoke so movingly at Arlington.

Mr. INOUE volunteered for the 442d when a youngster of 19, as a private. He received a combat commission in Italy in 1944, eventually being discharged as a captain. His great moment came in the closing stage of the war in the Mediterranean, on April 21, 1945, during the final Allied drive. INOUE was leading an attack by Company E against the 3d Battalion of the crack 361st Panzer Grenadier Regiment, dug in to defend Mount Mebbione, on the formidable

Gothic line. This was the main part of the Germans' final resistance before Genoa and the Po Valley.

The young lieutenant first led his platoon in a rapid encirclement that resulted in destruction of a German mortar observation post and brought his men to within 40 yards of the main hostile force. The enemy, dug into bunkers and rock crevices, fought back fanatically, halting the advance with crossfire from three machineguns which swept the area clear of cover and concealment. Then INOUE crawled up the slope to within 5 yards of the enemy and tossed two hand grenades into the machine gun nest. Before the enemy recovered, he stood up and raked the second gun with the fire from his tommygun, killing the crew. He was hit once, but he continued to fire at the other emplacements until his arm was shattered by a grenade. In spite of his pain and his wound, he refused evacuation and directed the final assault which carried the ridge. In the attack, 25 Germans were killed and 8 others captured. For this action, INOUE received the Distinguished Service Cross. He also earned the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart with two oak leaf clusters, five battle stars, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and the Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation with four clusters, among his awards, for his actions with the 442d Combat Team.

Like many another young veteran, DAN INOUE got his advanced schooling after the war. A BA in government and economics at the University of Hawaii was followed by a doctorate of jurisprudence at George Washington University Law School, in 1952. He served as assistant public prosecutor for the city of Honolulu, and this proved the beginning of a spectacular career in public office. He was elected to the territorial house of representatives in 1954, becoming its majority leader. He went on to the territorial senate in 1958. When Hawaii achieved statehood, he won a seat in Congress by more than 100,000 votes. His record as a first-term resulted in INOUE's election to the Senate in 1962.

As a Californian, representing a State which owes much to its citizens of Japanese ancestry, and as a veteran of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations, I proudly ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to inscribe in the RECORD Senator INOUE's Arlington speech of June 2.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, JUNE 2, 1963

As we gather together here today to honor our valiant dead, I cannot help but feel that it is only fitting that we stand on this sacred soil almost in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol. For here in Washington are the very institutions which make up the flesh and blood, the heart and soul of what we call democracy.

Here are centered the very ideals our honored dead fought for. One need not look far to know that these ideals are still very much alive and flourishing.

But for these men to whom we pay tribute on this day, our flag might not fly over the

White House. But our flag is still there and the White House remains the symbol of the determination and vision which has kept the United States in the forefront of world leadership.

In our Supreme Court honored Justices still zealously guard the rights of freemen in our Nation, regardless of race, creed, or color. Indeed we have come a long way from the battlefields of France and Italy—from those distant shellpocked Pacific islands—in our fight for equal rights for all. Our Congress still meets in free assembly, freemen freely chosen by a free people.

Our dead have become part of the great history of our country. They have joined those great men of our past—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt who guided us unerringly through the last world holocaust.

These fighting men we honor today are no less great. Each one, in his own way, gave up his life for a greater life—the life of the United States of America.

It is because of them that the torch of freedom still illuminates the dark corners of the world and keeps tyranny at bay.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II, particularly since so many were, and are, from my congressional district in Los Angeles County.

Recently, on May 18, I was honored with a special citation that was presented me at the biennial convention of the Pacific Southwest District Council of the Japanese American Citizens League. This district council embraces all of southern California and Arizona and is one of the eight district councils of the league in the country. The citation expressed the appreciation of the league and others of Japanese ancestry in this country for what they were good enough to call "my leadership" in the Congress in the past 21 years in which I have had the privilege to serve in the House, in securing corrective and remedial legislation for those of Japanese ancestry.

The citation was presented by the league's national president, K. Patrick Okura, now of Omaha, Nebr., but in pre-war days a resident of Terminal Island in my district. Pat had three brothers who served in World War II. One was killed in action with the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team of Japanese Americans.

As my colleagues so well know, once the heroic, yet tragic record of wartime loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry became known to us, through the exploits of Japanese American troops in Italy, France, and the Pacific, it was not the difficult and impossible task that it might otherwise have been. Certainly, there is no doubt that these loyal Americans who were forced to give up their homes and businesses when they were evacuated in the spring of 1942 should have been compensated for at least some of their property losses. Certainly, too,

the parents of these brave GI's, denied the right to naturalization because of our Federal statutes, deserved to share the citizenship of their children. And, most certainly, the long-deserving Territory of Hawaii should have been admitted to statehood long before 1959.

Though Japanese Americans, in the words of the late Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, "bought an awfully big hunk of America with their blood," in a sense their sacrifices have not been in vain, for today they are respected citizens in every community in the land, relieved of their legal and social discriminations that used to plague them in most Western States, and able to look into a promising future with confidence.

We in our district are pleased to note that Mrs. Nawa Munemori was a participant in the commemorative services which were held on June 2 and that the President paid her special tribute at a meeting the next morning in the White House, for she is the mother of the late Pfc. Sadao S. Munemori, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously in Italy with the 442d. A grateful Nation renamed a U.S. troop transport in her son's memory, the U.S.S. *Pot. Sadao S. Munemori*, the only American vessel with a Japanese American name.

At a time when our country and our people may tend to forget that patriotism and loyalty are still worthwhile virtues, it may be well to read again the citation that summarizes the single action that earned for a young American who had to volunteer for the Army from a relocation camp, our Nation's highest decoration for valor:

Pfc. Sadao S. Munemori, an assistant squad leader of Company A, 100th Infantry Battalion, 442d Regimental Combat Team, fought with great gallantry and intrepidity on April 5, 1945, near Seravezza, Italy.

When his unit was pinned down by grazing fire from the enemy's strong mountain defense and command of the squad devolved on him with the wounding of its regular leader, he made frontal, one-man attacks through direct fire and knocked out two machineguns with grenades.

Withdrawing under murderous fire and shower of grenades from other enemy emplacements, he had nearly reached a shell crater occupied by two of his men when an unexploded grenade bounced on his helmet and rolled toward his helpless comrades. He arose into the withering fire, dived for the missile, and smothered its blast with his body.

By his swift, supremely heroic action, Private Munemori saved two of his men at the cost of his own life and did much to clear the path for his company's victorious advance.

Among other Japanese Americans who served in the U.S. Army are the nine Nakada brothers, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Ginzo Nakada, who were evacuated from Long Beach in the spring of 1942, along with others of Japanese ancestry. As far as I have been able to ascertain, no other American family, regardless of nationality, has sent so many sons into our Army. Yoshinao served with the Office of Strategic Services; Henry and George with the 442d in Europe; John with military intelligence in Alaska; Saburo, Minoru, James, and Yoshio with military intelligence in the Pacific; and

Stephen, with the Military Intelligence Service Language School. Six of the Nakada brothers still reside in my district.

In closing, may I quote "The Japanese American Creed," which was written before World War II by Mike Masaoka, whom many of us know as the Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League. It was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first time in May 1941 by the late Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, then chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Through the travail of evacuation and relocation, our Japanese American citizens lived this creed, which has meaning not only to Americans of Japanese ancestry today but also to all Americans, without reference to race, color, creed, or national origin:

THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CREED

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals, and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way: above-board, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, as a native of Idaho who grew up with many of the Japanese Americans from southeastern Idaho who served in World War II and who numbers many more among my friends and supporters, I am privileged to join in paying tribute to the Japanese Americans who achieved such a distinguished record in our Armed Forces in World War II.

As has been noted before, five of the Japanese Americans who lie in honored

glory in Arlington National Cemetery are from southeastern Idaho. They are Private Raito and Sgt. Wataru Nakashima, of Pocatello; Pfc. Kiyoshi Murakami, also of Pocatello; Pfc. Hiroshi Nagano, of Blackfoot; and Pvt. Roy R. Shiozawa, of Tyhee.

This is not to suggest that these five were the only Japanese Americans from the State of Idaho who died in the defense of our country in World War II, for the number is considerably higher. But, the ratio of 5 of the 21 American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who are interred in Arlington being from my State is indicative of the great number who served from Idaho. Indeed, it is my understanding that on a per capita basis, more Japanese Americans volunteered for duty and served in World War II from Idaho than from any other State, with the possible exception of then Territory of Hawaii.

An estimated 20 from Pocatello served in the 442d Regimental Combat Team alone. From the Idaho Falls area, some 35 to 40 served in both the European and Pacific theaters of operations. And, from the Rexburg-St. Anthony area, some 30 served with the 442d and with military intelligence in the Pacific.

When one considers that there are only about a thousand persons of Japanese ancestry of all ages in the whole area, this is a remarkable percentage, especially when one considers that many, if not most, were not subject to the draft because they were so needed in agriculture and the food for victory program.

Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima of Pocatello and Mrs. H. Nagano of Blackfoot were able to participate in the commemorative services on June 2. The following afternoon, I was privileged to cohost an informal luncheon for these Gold Star Parents from Idaho and other States in the House dining room along with my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA, himself one of the great Japanese American war heroes of World War II.

As many of my colleagues know, we in the West owe much to our immigrant Japanese, the parents of these brave soldiers who fought so well in Europe and the Pacific. They came more than half a century ago to work on the railroads, to help tie the Nation together with iron rails. They came too to convert the sage brush and the deserts into rich agricultural lands. That Idaho today raises the finest potatoes in the United States is also partly a testament to their skill and hard work.

Perhaps coincidentally, the Nakashimas, the Naganos, and the Shiozawas were among the pioneers who farmed our lands and helped develop the richness of the soil in southeastern Idaho. And, the Murakamis worked on the railroads. Together, these Japanese contributed more than their share to the conquering of the frontier and the development of our region.

Today, the sons of these Japanese pioneers are pioneering again—in the Magic Valley area near Twin Falls, Japanese Americans are showing the way in reclaiming sagebrush lands into fertile potato and wheat farms. Truly, they have

accomplished the proverbial miracle of making the desert bloom as a rose.

It is not possible, of course, for me at this time to call the honor roll of Japanese Americans from Idaho who served in our Armed Forces in World War II. But, here are the names of some who come to mind: The Shiozaki brothers of Blackfoot, Hero, Mike, and Jun; Kiyo Morimoto, of Pocatello, now with the Harvard University faculty, who won a Silver Star; and Harvey Yamashita and Kazuo Endo, also of Pocatello, who were wounded in action and earned Purple Hearts. All of these men were with the famous 442d Regimental Combat Team. In addition my neighbors Leo and Paul Hosoda of St. Anthony and my friend Bill Yoden of Blackfoot as well as many other Japanese Idahoans served with honor.

Of interest may be that Togo Hikida won both the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart with the 442d in Italy and France. His brother, Ted Fuji Hikida, is the mayor of Teton City, probably the only Japanese American outside Hawaii and California to be elected mayor of an incorporated city.

No summation of Japanese American soldiery in southeastern Idaho, however, is complete without that of Pvt. Roy Ichiro Miyasaki, for whom the Army Reserve building at Rexburg is named. As far as we know, this is the only public building in the United States officially named in honor of a Japanese American soldier. Miyasaki won the Distinguished Service Cross in Korea, near Tamyong-Dong, on June 12, 1951. As his squad participated in clearing an area between two Communist-held hills, the enemy, behind a well-protected bunker commanding the whole terrain, began to blanket in the entire area with heavy mortar and machinegun fire. When the Browning automatic rifleman in his squad was wounded, Miyasaki took over the heavy weapon and continued to advance in the face of murderous fire, even though he himself was wounded. He finally took the bunker by himself, killing a number of the enemy in the process, and thereby opening up the advance for his entire unit. He defended the bunker against a furious enemy counterattack and held it until Allied units arrived to take it over. While moving to the attack again, he was killed by an exploding mortar shell.

Private Miyasaki has a brother, Tommy, who is a permanently blind veteran of World War II. Two other brothers served during World War II—Akira with the 442d in Italy and France, and Tateshi in military intelligence in the Pacific, where he won the Bronze Star Medal and an oak-leaf cluster. Still another brother, Katsumi, served with him in Korea.

We in southeastern Idaho believe that the Miyasakis of Rexburg, typify the kind of citizenry that represents our Japanese American society.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for taking this

time to pay tribute to Americans of Japanese descent who served with our Armed Forces during World War II. Reference was made a moment ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] in regard to the operation of the Allied Translator and Interpreter Section in the Pacific theater under General MacArthur's command. I just wanted to comment on the fact that as a member of that section it was my privilege and honor to have had several Americans of Japanese ancestry serving with me and under me during a part of the Pacific campaigns. Actually, the Navy had always refused to enlist Nisei, but the Army did enlist them, and we found in the Pacific theater, where General MacArthur unified the services without waiting for any further action, that the only effective translation and interpretation services required the combined services of Americans of Japanese descent and other Americans who had acquired some knowledge of the Japanese language, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] and myself had the opportunity to do. These Americans of Japanese descent served with great distinction. They took, as you can imagine, very serious risks in serving in the Pacific theater had they been captured, and the record indicates that they served with the same high degree of bravery and distinction with which they also performed in the European theater. I want to join with my colleagues in commending these Japanese Americans for the magnificent job that they did then, and for the great role that they are playing in America today, as exemplified by the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], and our former colleague in the House, now serving in the other body, DAN INOUE.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my heart is very close to the Japanese Americans. For a number of years I had, as my constituents, more Japanese Americans than any other Member of the House of Representatives. That, of course, is not true at the present time, but I still have a large Japanese American constituency. They are leaders in many worthy activities, prominent in the professions and in business, a vital part of our cultural and community life.

The first Japanese American congressional secretary was Mary Ono, who has been in my office for 12 years. Her husband is Harry Ono, a veteran of that famous 442d. So, I am much surrounded by sentiment for Japanese Americans.

Mr. Speaker, there is no brighter page in American history than that written by Japanese Americans. Here they were at the commencement of the war with Japan, fine, loyal and educated Americans, born in our beloved America, graduates of colleges, put through these colleges by the sweat and the toll of their fathers and mothers who were not permitted to be citizens. With the war came blind suspicion of anyone of Japanese name or blood. They were taken from their homes and friends, and imprisoned

as suspected enemies of the land of their birth and of their love. From all of this cruel misunderstanding and this period of agonizing mistreatment, they emerged with their love of the United States undiminished, undisturbed, their spirit and faith in our warm country unscarred. What they had gone through they accepted as the test of their Americanism, and they met that test with a heroism on the battlefields, never surpassed and a dedication to good citizenry that has been an inspiration to all their fellow Americans.

I do not know of any group in the history of our country who has suffered so much without justification and has come out of it to make such a great contribution with never a scar of resentment or faltering in their love of and loyalty to country. God bless the Japanese Americans.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to join the others here today who pay tribute to those Americans of Japanese ancestry who gave up their lives for their country during the Second World War. It is both proper and encouraging to hear expressions of respect paid to these Americans.

The meaning of this struggle for recognition and dignity was exemplified by the speeches which were delivered at the commemorative services honoring these Americans at Arlington National Cemetery on June 2, 1963. Those of us in attendance were reminded once again of the sacrifices this distinguished group of Americans made in order to be recognized by some as first-class citizens.

One such speech was that delivered by my distinguished colleague and good friend from Hawaii, himself an American of Japanese ancestry and Purple Heart veteran of both the famed 100th Infantry Battalion and of the Military Intelligence Service. So that the Members of this body may have the full benefit of Congressman MATSUNAGA's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

TO HONOR OUR DEAD

(By Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Arlington National Cemetery, June 2, 1963)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a deep sense of humility and gratitude that I join you in paying tribute to the honored war dead, for had it not been for them, I know I would not be here today to address you as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I like to think that the valiant men in whose memory we gather here today fought and died for me—fought and died so that those of us who survived them, the living, might enjoy freedom with justice. I'd like to point to the distinguished U.S. Senator from Hawaii who spoke before me and to offer myself along with him as living proofs that they whom we honor here today did not die in vain. To paraphrase the statement of President Truman when he presented the seventh Presidential Unit Citation to

the men of the 442d Infantry Regiment, "They fought against prejudice and won." William E. Gladstone, the great English statesman, once said, "Show me the manner in which a nation or a community cares for its dead and I will measure with mathematical exactness the sympathies of its people, their respect for the laws of the land, and their loyalty to high ideas."

There was a time when a gathering such as this would have been looked down upon by some of our fellow Americans as being akin to ancestor worship. We have found, however, that with maturity Americans have begun more and more to pay honors to their dead. And so it is, with honor and with reverence, that we pay tribute to those who lie within these hallowed grounds, at Pohukaina, and other cemeteries throughout the world.

If we the living, the beneficiaries of their sacrifices are truly intent upon showing our gratitude, we must do more than gather together for speechmaking and perfunctory ceremonies. We must undertake to carry on the unfinished work which they so nobly advanced. The fight against prejudice is not confined to the battlefield alone. It is still here and now with us. So long as a single member of our citizenry is denied the use of public facilities and denied the right to earn a decent living because, and solely because of the color of his skin, we who "fought against prejudice and won" ought not sit idly by and tolerate the perpetuation of injustices.

The fight against prejudice is a long and painstaking one. Education is the most formidable weapon against it, but education is a slow and tedious process. The temper of our Nation today is such that we cannot wait any longer for the slow wheels of education to grind out social justice. Patience among the downtrodden is running out and we must look to a more expeditious way. That way, I believe, is the way of the law.

Despite the display of violence over the last few months in certain areas of our country, Americans are undeniably a law-abiding people. Prejudices may drive them to violence, but experience has shown that when confronted with the law, their violence will yield to peaceful compliance. While wiser men will certainly differ, I do believe that the law-abiding nature of our Nation's people will now allow racial prejudice to be outlawed and abolished by legislation and enforcement of the law.

We who have won in our fight against prejudice have a better understanding of the plight of those who continue to be subjected to racial prejudice. In the name of fair play we can serve our fellow Americans by working for elimination of injustices through enactment of appropriate laws at the State and National levels.

In the final analysis, man will best serve himself through law, for as history has repeatedly shown, justice best prevails through the law.

Let us then here resolve in paying tribute to our honored dead, that we shall not rest until through the rule of law, as was so movingly stated by Vice President JOHNSON at Gettysburg, "Justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with men's skins." Thank you.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON], may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. Speaker, while New Mexico cannot boast of as many Japanese Americans who served in World War II as many of our neighboring States, we can, however, point with pride to the fact that the only living Japanese American Congressional Medal of Honor winner lives among us, in Gallup, N. Mex.

He is Hiroshi Miyamura, whom most of us call "Hershey," owner and operator of a service station in Gallup.

Although he won the Nation's highest decoration for valor in Korea, he received his baptism of fire with the famed 442d Japanese American Regimental Combat Team, about which we have heard so much this afternoon. He was a replacement for that combat team, just as was Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously in Italy. Both participated in the final Po Valley campaign, which ended in the defeat of the German armies in Italy.

"Hershey" was a sergeant in Korea with the 7th Infantry Regiment. He was captured as a wounded prisoner of war after his heroic actions near Taejon-Ni, late in April 1951. It was not until he was exchanged for Korean prisoners of war after the armistice was signed at Freedom Village in August 1953, after 29 months in enemy hands, that he learned that he had earned the Congressional Medal of Honor. His award had to be kept secret, for there is no telling what his Communist captors would have done to him had they known of his high honor.

Then President Eisenhower personally decorated him with the Medal of Honor at special White House ceremonies in the summer of 1954.

The citation for his Medal of Honor is a remarkable reminder of what patriotic Americans, regardless of their race, color, creed, and ancestry, can do when our Nation's honor is at stake.

The citation reads as follows:

(Sergeant) Cpl. Hiroshi H. Miyamura (Service No. XXXXXXXXXX), Infantry, Army of the United States, a member of Company H, 7th Infantry Regiment, 3d Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Taejon-Ni, Korea, on April 24 and 25, 1951.

On the night of April 24, Company H was occupying a defensive position when the enemy fanatically attacked, threatening to overrun the position.

Corporal Miyamura, a machinegun squad leader, aware of the imminent danger to his men, unhesitatingly jumped from his shelter wielding his bayonet in close, hand-to-hand combat, killing approximately 10 of the enemy. Returning to his position, he administered first aid to the wounded and directed their evacuation as another savage assault hit the line. He manned his machinegun and delivered withering fire until his ammunition was expended. He ordered the squad to withdraw, while he remained behind to render the gun inoperative. He then bayoneted his way through infiltrated enemy soldiers to a second gun emplacement and assisted in its operation.

When the intensity of the attack necessitated the withdrawal of the company, Corporal Miyamura ordered his men to fall back while he remained to cover their movement. He killed more than 50 of the enemy before his ammunition was depleted and he was

severely wounded. He maintained his magnificent stand despite his painful wounds, continuing to repel the attack until his position was overrun.

When last seen, he was fighting ferociously against an overwhelming number of enemy soldiers.

Corporal Miyamura's indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty reflect the utmost glory on himself and uphold the illustrious traditions of the military service.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II, I note with both sorrow and pride that of the 21 Japanese American war heroes who sleep in the hallowed ground of the Arlington National Cemetery, 4 are from my State of Oregon.

Pfc. Victor K. Hada, Cpl. Jimmie T. Kokubu, Pfc. Thomas T. Kuge, and Pvt. Stanley Oba. All four were killed in action with the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team, the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service. Altogether, more than 9,000 suffered casualties, with more than 600 killed in action. The few who are interred in Arlington are but symbolic of the tremendous toll suffered by Japanese American troops.

The Members of this House know personally of the patriotism of the Japanese Americans who fought in World War II. Members of the two famous Nisei fighting groups in Europe have served as Members of this House. Senator DANIEL K. INOUE, our beloved former colleague and my dear friend, served as an officer in the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team. SPARKY MATSUNAGA, the able new Member from Hawaii, was an officer in the 100th Infantry Battalion.

The brave exploits of the Nisei who fought in Europe are well known and a stirring movie was made telling of their dramatic exploits. However, relatively little is known about the important military intelligence activities of the more than 15,000 Japanese American troops that served in the Pacific. As a Navy communications officer in the Pacific during World War II, I heard of their work, but hardly imagined that it was so extensive and impressive. In recognizing their services, one must not forget that when Nisei soldiers were captured by the Japanese forces, their treatment was far more difficult than for other American servicemen.

Perhaps the greatest Japanese American war hero of World War II in the Pacific was Sgt. Frank Hachiya. It gives me great personal pride to tell my colleagues that Frank Hachiya came from Hood River in my own congressional district. His story is probably the most dramatic example of the amazing courage and loyalty of these Americans who had to fight a war under not only desperate and dangerous conditions, but also had to suffer terrible discrimination and prejudice toward their loved ones at home. I have been told that Frank Hachiya's dramatic story would have been portrayed in a movie but it was considered to be just too unbelievable. I would like to summarize briefly his story as reported in the Selective Service System's Report on Special Groups.

The 1942 military evacuation from the west coast of all persons of Japanese ancestry resulted in Frank Hachiya going to the Minidoka Relocation Center in Hunt, Idaho. Not considered acceptable for service in the Army he was therefore ineligible for the draft. Nevertheless he volunteered for combat duty. Because he had some knowledge of Japanese, he was assigned to military intelligence duty in the Pacific.

Several months before the invasion of Leyte, that famous battleground in the Philippines, he volunteered for intelligence work behind the enemy lines. By the time of the invasion, he had mapped out the complete Japanese defenses for Leyte. When the invasion began, he started to crawl out in front of the Japanese lines toward the landing American troops. He was mortally wounded by fire from our own men. Nevertheless, he managed to crawl far enough to lay the maps showing the island's defenses at the feet of an American officer. A grateful Nation posthumously awarded him the Distinguished Service Cross, the highest decoration awarded to a Japanese American in the Pacific theater.

The life of Sergeant Hachiya symbolizes well the story of the Japanese American soldiers of World War II. Unwanted by the Army, he could not be drafted. Suspected by his own Government, he was confined in a relocation camp. He insisted upon serving our country, so he volunteered. Given the most trying of assignments, to fight against those of his own ancestry and culture, he was mistakenly shot and killed by his own comrades. Though he died, his courage resulted in the saving of the lives of thousands of his countrymen.

Surely no other group can surpass the record of the Japanese American soldiers for loyalty and patriotism under arduous conditions while they and their loved ones at home suffered from terrible discrimination and injustice. Their record of outstanding citizenship during wartime is only matched by their records during peacetime. The Japanese Americans in my own district are noted for their industriousness and model citizenship. Most of my Nisei constituents work in farming and related activities in Hood River County, the home area of Sergeant Hachiya, and in Malheur County. The quality of their crops and their general efficiency in both production and marketing is well known.

This country has a great debt of gratitude and restitution to pay both those who suffered at the battlefield and at the homefront. Last year I was pleased to have worked with my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman CECIL KING of California, to insure proper tax treatment for the financial compensation our country made to those who had suffered property losses as a result of the 1942 evacuation.

Many of my own constituents suffered personally in the relocation camps that this Nation so tragically established during the hysteria just after Pearl Harbor.

We are fortunate that the great personal fortitude and deep loyalty of these fellow Americans precluded any

lasting feelings of bitterness. Outstanding examples of this deep love of country are Kay and Kitty Hisatomi, who were moved to the relocation camp at Tulelake, Calif., though they were both born and raised in this country. This family has such love of country that their son, John Hisatomi, wants to follow in the footsteps of his two uncles, much decorated veterans of the 442d, and serve in his country's defense. As my colleagues know, my appointments to the military academies are strictly competitive. It, therefore, gave me special pride to announce that John Hisatomi finished first among my nominees and so received my principal appointment this year to West Point.

I take pride today in joining the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER, in paying tribute to those of Japanese descent who have lived up to the highest tradition of heroism in the defense of our country. They are indeed great Americans.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to join with my colleagues today to honor those loyal Japanese Americans, who despite harsh treatment by this country, volunteered to defend this Nation against her enemies during World War II. Only one or two generations removed from their homeland, they fought to preserve our American heritage. The Japanese Americans are indeed a living tribute to the foundations and principles of our Nation. They prove that "Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."

We can all remember the treatment accorded to these people during the early years of the war, when, because of so-called "racial affinity," they were torn away from their homes on the west coast and sent to relocation camps in the interior part of the country. There, they lived in almost concentration camp conditions. Our Nation openly doubted their loyalty, integrity, and pride in the American way. If any race living in America should have lost faith in America, it should have been the Japanese Americans. But, they defied that doubt, and finally, in 1943, they were at last given the opportunity to prove their Americanism and join our forces overseas. They had begged and petitioned for this for 2 long bitter years, and when they were at last given this opportunity, the response was overwhelming.

As you know, these volunteers composed the main force of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, and became the most decorated unit in our military history for its size and length of service. The 100th Infantry Battalion, composed mainly of Hawaiian National Guard members, became equally as famous.

The record of individual acts of bravery and patriotism by the Nisei is long indeed, and yet as Ernie Pyle pointed out, most of their personal bravery decorations were awarded for saving the lives of their comrades. Two Japanese Americans from Washington who were killed in action are buried at Arlington National Cemetery. Over 50 are in-

terred in the Washelli Cemetery in Seattle.

We cannot overlook the great contributions made by those Nisei who served in the Pacific in the intelligence branches. Due to their efforts, we knew more about our enemy than ever before in the history of the United States, and it is said that the Nisei intelligence work shortened the war in the Pacific by 2 years. Time and time again throughout the pages of World War II history, the valor and bravery of the Japanese Americans are illustrated. They are indeed the subject of a unique chapter in our history, and the American Nation and the free world is highly indebted to them.

I would also like to point with pride to the record established by the Nisei who came from the Seattle area of Washington State, which I represent. Most of the Japanese Americans from this area were sent to the Minidoka Relocation Center in Idaho. It is generally agreed that the greatest number of mainland volunteers came from this relocation camp. About 1,000 Japanese Americans from the Seattle area served in Europe and in the Pacific during the war. This was one-seventh of the total Japanese population in the Seattle area, which is one of the highest service records of any nationality group in this country.

Let me mention just a few of the many individuals who met the great challenge and who surmounted staggering odds to fight for their country. All are from the Seattle area.

First. The four Sakura brothers of Seattle; all served in the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Second. Shiro Kashino, one of the most decorated soldiers of our area, who is today a successful businessman in Seattle.

Third. Harry Takagi, who also fought with the 442d in all seven major campaigns, who is today one of the highest Japanese Americans in our Government.

Fourth. Henry Goshu, who participated in the combat intelligence in the Pacific and served with the famed Merrill's Marders. He won the bronze star medal, among other awards, and was the first Japanese American to be appointed to the Foreign Service.

Fifth. William Marutani, who was a commissioned officer in the Counterintelligence Corps in Japan. Today, he resides in Philadelphia and is a member of one of the country's most distinguished law firms.

Now, I would especially like to pay tribute to Mr. Mike Masaoka, the Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League. As some of you already know, Mr. Masaoka was the first Japanese American to volunteer for the Japanese American combat team from the mainland. He was also one of five brothers who served in the Armed Forces, which is more than any other known American family. Mr. Masaoka is the author of the moving and heartwarming Japanese American creed, which expresses the depth of the loyalty and bravery to be found in the hearts of the Nisei. He is an American citizen in the highest sense, and it would be won-

derful indeed if every American held our country with the same reverence and high esteem as Mr. Masaoka and his people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the only American of Japanese ancestry in this body, I am sure I speak for all Americans of Japanese ancestry in saying that I am extremely grateful for the kind and gracious remarks of the gentlemen from California, Congressmen MILLER, KING, EDWARDS, ROYBAL, VAN DEERLIN, and LEGGETT; and of the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman CUNNINGHAM; of the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman ULLMAN; of the gentlemen from Idaho, Congressmen HARDING and WHITE; of the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman MONTOYA; the gentleman from New York, Congressman STRATTON; the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman O'HARA; and of the gentleman from Hawaii, Congressman GILL.

It is true that the Japanese American paid a high price in blood and lives to prove his loyalty to the United States. But it is also true that the Japanese American has no regrets that he paid such a price. He is grateful to the people of the United States for having given him the opportunity to prove his love for his country. He is grateful too for his unqualified acceptance by his fellow Americans into the greatest democratic society the world has ever known.

In demonstration of our gratitude we Americans of Japanese ancestry pledge ourselves to uphold the Federal Constitution, to contribute to our utmost toward the welfare of our great Nation, and to continue to prove to the world that Americanism is a matter of the heart and mind and not one of race or color.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to participate with my colleague from Alameda County in paying my respects to the accomplishments of the Americans of Japanese ancestry.

My State of California is a great melting pot. The gentleman from Alameda [Mr. MILLER] and myself share a common Italian ancestry and we are proud of this ancestry, and no less Americans.

Japanese Americans can be similarly proud of the great things this nationality has accomplished. My fellow Cali-

fornians and myself remember the great accomplishments of the all-Japanese battalions fighting in Italy and we thank these Japanese Americans for assisting in liberating our homeland. Being men of good will we attempt to forget the aggressive actions of one imperialistic Japanese Empire and likewise to live down the oppressive treatment of Japanese in California and the series of oppressive unconstitutional laws which we have set aside.

The Japanese came to California before the turn of the century over 40,000 strong to respond to the labor needs of California agriculture. Before Japanese came Chinese and after them came Hindus, Italians, Germans, Filipinos, and eventually the Mexican nationals. Where we go from here we do not know. Of this group the Japanese have probably assimilated better than any. They are great producers today of agriculture in the Fourth Congressional District of California. Likewise they are an extremely lawful people who claim a share of public welfare practically never.

I salute the Japanese American Citizens League of the Fourth District for the fine part this organization plays in this wonderful heritage.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to those Americans of Japanese ancestry who served our Nation during World War II. We owe a debt of gratitude to these men who served their country with such distinction and valor during this period.

I have the honor to represent a district in which we have a large number of Americans of Japanese ancestry. I am happy to recognize their patriotism, and their loyalty to their country during World War II when they were faced with many difficult problems. Some of these persons are numbered among our most substantial citizens in Colorado, and they have made a most valuable contribution to the growth and development of our State, particularly in agriculture. Some of our largest and most successful farmers are Americans of Japanese descent.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate in these tributes to those brave Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in our Armed Forces during World War II.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues have now introduced into the record the very eloquent and informative tributes to Japanese Americans who served in World War II.

In addition to these speeches, Dr. Stanley Nagahashi, now of Philadelphia but who was born in Sacramento, Calif., sang "The JACL Hymn," and William Marutani, a national JACL vice president and its legal counsel, also of Philadelphia, read "The Japanese American Creed," both of which are commended to all Americans as expressions of the highest idealism and Americanism. Marutani, a native of Kent, Wash., served in the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Military Intelligence Group as a commissioned officer in Japan. An attorney, he is a partner in the distinguished Phila-

delphia law firm of MacCoy, Evans and Lewis.

MEETING WITH PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The following morning, June 3, 1963, Mrs. Munemori and her daughters from Los Angeles, Mrs. Thomas Tamura and Miss Kiku Munemori, national JACL president and Mrs. Okura, Judge Also, and Washington JACL representative Masaoka, met the President in the White House. There, they also met the Vice President. The meeting was arranged by Senator INOUE. Congressman MATSUNAGA was also a member of the party.

Mrs. Munemori presented the President with the history of the 442d Combat Team, published by the Infantry Journal and entitled "Americans." Judge Also presented the President with a copy of the "MISLS Album," the story of the Military Intelligence Service Language Schools. National JACL president Okura presented a copy of "Beauty Behind Barbed Wire," by the late Allen H. Eaton, which tells about the arts and handicrafts of the evacuees, and explains the inner character and the love of beauty and order of the Japanese American even when confined to desert wastelands.

They were then taken on a special tour of the White House.

That afternoon, Congressman MATSUNAGA hosted a luncheon for the White House party and the other visiting Gold Star parents, Mr. and Mrs. Nagato, Mr. and Mrs. Nakashima, and Mrs. Nagano. Thereafter, he took them on a personally conducted tour of the Capitol.

ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE

All of us are most familiar with the endless detail and the tremendous work involved in any type of public program. Accordingly, I feel that in addition to paying tribute to Japanese Americans who served in World War II we should extend our appreciation for a difficult program well executed to the members of the special JACL arrangements committee.

By coincidence, every member of the committee either served in the Armed Forces in World War II or had brothers who did so. And, with few exceptions, all are evacuees from the West Coast. Moreover, all today hold responsible positions in the community.

Honorary cochairmen were Senator DANIEL INOUE and Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA.

Chairman for both the program and the committee was Mike Masaoka, whom many of us have known over the years as the effective and eloquent spokesman for Americans of Japanese ancestry in this country. As the national secretary and field executive of the JACL at the time of the outbreak of war, he was among those who provided the visionary and statesmanlike leadership that has been the hallmark of the JACL through the years since it was first organized in 1930. He was among those who most vigorously urged the War Department and the President to accept Japanese American volunteers into the Army, and he was the first to volunteer when that proposal was accepted. Four other brothers also volunteered with Mike—Ben Frank, who is interred here in Arlington; Ike, a 100-

percent disabled veteran now residing in Los Angeles; Hank, who also lives in Los Angeles; and Tad, who resides near San Francisco.

After his honorable discharge from the 442d in December 1945, Mike came to Washington and it is he who has translated much of the good will achieved by the Japanese American GI into positive and constructive legislation for the benefit of Americans of Japanese ancestry in this country. A leading national magazine once described him as "Washington's most successful lobbyist," while a recent national television broadcast paid tribute to him as the outstanding Japanese American in the past quarter century. As one who has cooperated with him in his legislative efforts for almost two decades, much of the time under difficult circumstances, I believe that it can be said without doubt that most of the public and private legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the postwar years has had the stamp of Mike Masaoka on it. He probably personifies as well as anyone "The Japanese American Creed" he authored more than 20 years ago.

Accordingly, it was most appropriate that he was the chairman for the commemorative services on June 2.

Miss Mary Toda, the secretary to the Washington JACL office, was the secretary of the committee. Formerly from Watsonville, Calif., she had a brother, James, who served with G-2 in the Pacific.

Joseph Ichiuji, now the Assistant Chief of the International Loan Branch, Acting Division Office of Controller, Agency for International Development, is an evacuee from Monterey, Calif. He volunteered and served with the 522d Field Artillery Battalion of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, along with two other brothers, Paul and Harry. Ichiuji served as treasurer of the committee.

Henry Goshio is the first Japanese American to become a Foreign Service officer. A native of Seattle, Wash., he is currently the chief of the East Asia branch of the Voice of America. He won fame and decorations as one of the first Nisei to serve in World War II, being with Merrill's Marauders in the China-India-Burma theater.

Edwin Mitoma is the chairman of the board of the Washington, D.C., JACL chapter. Evacuated out of Oakland, Calif., he served in the Army Signal Corps. He is currently employed as an electronics engineer at the U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratories.

Miss Hisako Sakata is from Cheyenne, Wyo. A brother George served with the 442d in Italy. She is currently the financial management analyst in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Miss Suzy Sakato recently resigned as a captain in the Army Nurse Corps Reserves. She is an anesthetist at the D.C. General Hospital. Born in Idaho, she was raised in Utah.

Mrs. Gladys Onoye Shimasaki has a brother, Lloyd, interred in Arlington. He was killed in action with the 442d. An evacuee from Salinas, Calif., now a housewife, she was the secretary of the

Washington JACL office when it first opened in 1946.

Ira Shimasaki, evacuated from Lindsay, Calif., served with the 310th Infantry Regiment in Germany. Two other evacuee brothers, Fred and Sam, also served in the Armed Forces of our country. The permanent chairman of JACL's Arlington Cemetery committee, since 1948 when the first Nisei were returned to this country for interment at Arlington, he has faithfully made certain that every Memorial Day every individual Nisei grave is decorated with fresh flowers. He is the manager of the paint and body department of Flood Pontiac.

Harry Takagi, another former Seatleite, served in the 442d. A brother, Calvin, also served in the armed services. Takagi is an associate member of the Board of Veterans Appeals of the Veterans' Administration.

Harry Takai, an evacuee from Los Angeles, served in Cannon Company, 442d Regimental Combat Team. Two other brothers, Jimmy and Joe, also served. He is the supervisor of the financial report for the Geological Survey.

John Yoshino, a constituent of mine from Alameda before the evacuation, is the deputy director of field service on the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Now the chairman of the eastern district council of the JACL, he was recently honored by his alma mater, Roosevelt University of Chicago, with the Eleanor Roosevelt Key as the Alumnus of the Year 1962. Last year too, he was one of the five finalists for the outstanding Japanese American of the biennium 1960-62 award and was presented a Distinguished Community Leadership Medal by the National JACL. He is the national membership chairman for the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, the professional society for social workers.

The committee has asked that we specially acknowledge the outstanding cooperation and help given it by Superintendent John C. Metzler of Arlington National Cemetery and Maj. Robert M. von Schlemmer, ceremony officer, of the Military District of Washington. We are pleased to do this, since we so seldom hear praise for our public servants from those with whom they work in such joint ventures as these.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Japanese American citizens of this country.

As a veteran of the European theater in World War II I know we owe a great debt of gratitude to those members of the Japanese American community that served in the Armed Forces during the late war.

We have, of course, representatives of that gallant body of men here in the Congress. Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE—a Member of this House in the 86th and 87th Congress and presently a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate—served in Italy with the 442d Regimental Combat Team. Senator INOUE lost his right arm in the Italian campaign, and

was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery.

Our distinguished colleague from Hawaii in this Congress, Hon. SPARK MATSUNAGA, served in the European theater with the 299th Infantry. He was wounded twice, and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to look beyond the confines of Capitol Hill to see living testimony to the heroism of the Japanese American soldier.

It may be of interest to recall the period of World War II. Our treatment of the Nisei is a shameful chapter in our national history.

On June 17, 1942, the War Department advised the Selective Service System to discontinue Nisei inductions until further notice. Soon afterward all Nisei were reclassified IV-C, not acceptable for service because of ancestry.

This lamentable period extended for several months, until January 1943 when the famous 442d Regimental Combat Team was organized. However, it was not until December 1943 that all barriers to the induction of the Nisei were lifted.

I think we can say with truth that it was the Japanese American fighting men that proved to our Government of that day the loyalty and patriotism of the Nisei.

The 100th Battalion, a Japanese American unit, went overseas to Europe in August 1943. In the first 3 months of service in Italy this unit lost one-third of its members as casualties.

During the first 6 months of service in the Italian campaign this battalion was awarded 900 Purple Hearts, 4 Distinguished Service Crosses, 36 Silver Stars, and 21 Bronze Stars. The 100th became known as the Purple Heart Battalion.

This single battalion by March 1945 had been awarded 1,547 Purple Hearts, 21 Distinguished Service Crosses, 7 Soldier's Medals, 6 Legions of Merit, 73 Silver Stars, 96 Bronze Stars, and 16 Divisional Citations.

Mr. Speaker, that record speaks for itself.

In April 1944 the 442d Regimental Combat Team arrived in Italy and the illustrious 100th Battalion became part of that larger unit. The motto of the 442d was "Go for Broke," and this was certainly destined to be the story of the Nisei soldier.

This gallant body of valiant men became the most decorated unit in U.S. military history. However, the price was high—the 442d suffered a total of 300 percent casualties by the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I think the words of Gen. Mark Clark, addressed to the 442d, say all that can be said to honor these fine men.

"You are always thinking of your country before yourselves. You have never complained through your long periods in the line. You have written a brilliant chapter in the history of the fighting men of America. You are always ready to close with the enemy, and you have always defeated him. The 34th Division is proud of you, the 5th Army is proud of you, and the whole United States is proud of you."

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 at Arlington National Cemetery commemorative services were held marking the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II. Previous commitments precluded me from attending this impressive ceremony but I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all those Americans of Japanese descent both living and dead who served in World War II.

I am very proud to have a large number of Japanese Americans in my congressional district. When in 1942 our Government's policy was to move those Japanese Americans inland, many eventually settled in our great city of Chicago, the center metropolis of the Midwest. They made their new homes around the neighborhoods near the University of Chicago and along the north Lake Shore. In a short time their energetic and loyal natures and their pleasing personalities made them an integral part of the community. They have become very active in civic affairs, mostly through the Japanese American Citizens League which does much to promote and foster a responsible and interested citizenry.

The chairman of the Midwest district council of the Japanese American Citizens League is Dr. Frank F. Sakamoto whom I know to be an able and conscientious worker in behalf of the league's interests. He is aided by such men as Mr. Mark Yoshizumi, chairman of the Chicago chapter, JACL, and Mr. Tomo Kosobayashi, chairman of the legislative committee.

Every 2 years, coinciding with the congressional and many local elections, the Japanese American Citizens League extends invitation to all candidates to appear before them and express their opinions and views. Each candidate is introduced by a different member of JACL, and after speaking for a few minutes then joins the audience to hear the remainder of the speakers. The league makes no recommendations to its members but lets them decide for themselves after having viewed and participated in the forum.

This is in the best American tradition and I am sure that all Nisei who fought for the American way of life under the American flag during World War II can well be proud of the heritage that Japanese Americans are continuing to contribute to our country, truly making the United States the world's greatest democracy.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a most impressive ceremony took place on the 2d of June. It took place in the quiet surroundings of the hallowed grounds of Arlington National Cemetery. It was a tribute to the Nisei, who were in the military service in World War II on the 20th anniversary of their participation.

This ceremony had a special significance for me because I have the honor of representing many Americans of Japanese ancestry in my district. I have walked among them and I have talked to them in the fields and in their shops. Their love of their country is moving

and it is an inspiration to talk to them. I had the great pleasure of campaigning with a distinguished citizen of Colorado who was elected to the Colorado House of Representatives last year. He is Seiji Horiuchi, a former national vice president of the junior chamber of commerce, and one of the most promising young legislators in Colorado.

The stories of bravery and courage displayed by the 33,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry who saw service in World War II are legend. The "Purple Heart Regiment," in 11 months of combat, suffered 9,480 casualties. Six hundred of these valiant men were killed. Nearly 9,500 Purple Hearts were awarded the members of this "Go-for-Broke" group.

It was the late Gen. Joe Stilwell who described them best: "They bought an awfully big hunk of America with their blood," he said.

Over 20 years ago, in 1941, the Japanese American creed was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first few lines of that creed describe beautifully and succinctly their belief:

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places.

Mr. Speaker, we are forever in the debt of these great Americans. It is an honor to pay tribute to them.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the accomplishments of the Americans of Japanese ancestry. Cleveland is fortunate in having among its citizens some unusually contributive and constructive Japanese Americans who have won our respect, admiration, and warm regard.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the heroic Japanese Americans who fought so valiantly in Italy and other places in World War II—many of whom gave their lives for the country that we share. They contributed greatly to our final victory. I am very happy to join my colleagues in commending these Japanese Americans for the magnificent job they did then, and for the splendid role they are playing in America today.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join with my colleagues in honoring the Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so bravely and valiantly in World War II, particularly since there are more Americans of Japanese ancestry living within the confines of the city of Los Angeles than any other city in America with the exception of our sister city in the Pacific, Honolulu. Nearly one-third of all Americans of Japanese ancestry, known familiarly as Nisei, have their homes in Los Angeles County. It has been my pleasure to have worked with Comdr. Jun Ogimachi of the San Fernando Valley Nisei Memorial Council, District No. 7, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, which post is located in Sun Valley, Calif., part of the district which I represent.

The wonderful record that the members of the 442d Japanese American combat team is well known throughout our great Nation, but the use and exploits of these Americans of Japanese ancestry as linguists in the Pacific theater of the war against the Japanese has not been such a well-known fact. Through their actions and sacrifices in this theater of operation the end of the war was brought to an earlier close. In World War II there were more than 33,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry that served their country valiantly; over half of this number had lived on the mainland of the United States.

The solemn and impressive ceremony that was held on June 2, 1963, in the environs of the hallowed and beautiful Arlington National Cemetery honoring these American men of Japanese ancestry was a sincere gesture from their country to commemorate the memories of those gallant Nisei that had made the supreme sacrifice to further the tenets of our country's long history of freedom and liberty for all mankind. May I add my humble salute to these American Japanese patriots.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and would like to associate myself with his very thoughtful remarks commending the Japanese Americans who served so valiantly in our country's service during World War II.

These brave men fought a double battle—one against this country's wartime enemies and another against racial prejudice. Though they were placed in relocation camps and otherwise discriminated against, these men chose to fight this discrimination by proving themselves true Americans on the battlefields of the war.

Many Japanese Americans had to fight an uphill battle just to enlist in our Armed Forces. Once they were permitted to join, however, they proved that this trust was not misplaced.

By serving America bravely and valiantly the Japanese Americans showed patriotism and citizenship to be matters of the heart and mind, rather than race or religion. I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in saluting the Japanese American Citizens League on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include her testimony on the food stamp bill.

Mr. REUSS.
Mr. GUBSER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 521. An act to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 522. An act to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 525. An act to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 526. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members have permission to insert their remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include extraneous matter:

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in one instance.

Mr. HARSHA in one instance.

Mr. GUBSER in one instance.

Mr. LIPSCOMB in one instance.

Mr. ALGER in five instances.

Mr. TUPPER in one instance.

Mr. TOLLEFSON in one instance.

Mr. UTT in three instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ in one instance.

Mr. YOUNGER in one instance.

Mr. OSMERS in three instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in one instance.

Mr. BERRY in one instance.

Mr. UTT in one instance.

Mr. ALGER in one instance.

Mr. MICHEL in one instance.

Mr. SNYDER in one instance.

Mr. BURTON in one instance.

Mr. CRAMER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will object to those extensions in more than one instance. And I might say that after today I will object to extensions in the Appendix of the daily RECORD by a second party. I object now unless the request is amended to include only one instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from South Dakota amend his requests for permission to include those extensions in only one instance?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request to include one instance for each Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following

Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the inclusion of remarks in the RECORD if they include extraneous matter of length exceeding one page.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object to the request otherwise?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the request of any Member to extend his own remarks in the body of the RECORD. If the membership will look at the RECORD of yesterday, for instance, they will find long speeches, testimony before committees, matter that appeared in hearings and other printed matter which is available elsewhere and has no place in the body of the RECORD. It clutters up the RECORD, adds to the expense. For that reason I am going to object to the inclusion of the extraneous material in connection with these remarks. I will not object to the inclusion of any remarks of any Member or short excerpts from any other material, but I do object to these inclusions of long extraneous material.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Would the gentleman consider remarks concerning Pope John XXIII as not worthy of inclusion in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say that those newspaper articles that were included, the proper place for them, in my opinion—and I am only expressing my own opinion—would be in the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the gentleman give, for the edification of those who are listening to him, a definition of extraneous matter?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think extraneous matter is matter that is irrelevant, is extraneous to the extension, matter that is not directly connected with the matter under discussion. If it is a newspaper article or things like that that are available from other sources that take up a lot of space in the permanent RECORD, which is printed and which might be available in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, I have no objection to that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to know who sets the standards of what is relevant and what is irrelevant. Would the gentleman give me some guidelines of what is relevant?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think if the gentleman had been here and heard my remarks—

Mr. MACDONALD. I heard the remarks at length. I will not say they cluttered up the RECORD, but I heard the remarks at length.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to say here we are operating in this House without any standards, so to speak. These rules have kind of grown like "Topsy." No one knows exactly what the rules are. I am hoping that we can in the near future bring about some order in the way we are operating here. There is no consistency with which we have operated in the past with reference to the body and the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I know I am irritating a lot of people here today, and I want to apologize for it, but I think I am pointing up a thing that needs to be corrected. I am hoping that some time in the future I can contribute something to doing that.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman given consideration to the introduction of a resolution, and then let the appropriate committee, in this case the Joint Committee on Printing, consider the question, rather than interposing an objection in relation to a custom that has continued for many, many years? It seems to me that the gentleman's position would be completely consistent if he were to announce that he was going to introduce such a resolution and did introduce such a resolution, and then see what the results might be.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say respectfully to the Speaker that I have introduced such resolutions in the past, but, like many other resolutions introduced in the past, there has to be more motivation other than by one person. I am trying to do that, and I think by the encouragement we have had here today we might do that. I spoke to a member of the Joint Committee on Printing and am advised they have not had a meeting this year.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Yesterday I introduced into the body of the RECORD a letter originating with me to the President's science adviser, in which I posed certain questions with respect to this all-important facet of our Government. He answered me with a rather lengthy letter that I believe should be known to all Members of the House. This was not a short statement. His letter was seven pages long and mine was about three pages. Just for my own information and as a guideline, would the gentleman say that this extraneous matter should not have been put into the RECORD?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say that the Appendix of the daily RECORD would have been a more appropriate place for it, particularly since such a thing in all probability will appear in the printed hearings of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. It will not appear in the printed hearings of the

committee. This information was for me and for the committee and for the House. I respectfully recognize the gentleman's ability to make these judgments, but in my judgment, I felt that the body of the RECORD, where it would be perpetuated, was a much better place to put them than the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say for the benefit of the gentleman and other Members that I am proceeding under the rules of this House. I am calling attention to the fact that there is possibly a need and a desirability for some change in the rules of the House.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was here at the beginning and listened to the gentleman's remarks. I know he has been dedicated to this project for many years. I certainly admire his persistence. I have no argument with the point he tries to put forth here. It did seem to me from the years I have been here, and speaking on just one of the gentleman's points, that there is, it seems to me, a great deal of time wasted when the Members have to stand up in the well to make these unanimous-consent requests. It would be much easier to give the requests to the majority leader and the minority leader and have them make the requests, because I think it saves a great deal of time. That was the only thing that concerned me with respect to the gentleman's position.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say I would agree with the gentleman to this extent. I think over the years a custom has grown up where many Members do not even come to the floor of the House and many Members feel it is not necessary even to make quorum calls, and yet they will have their remarks appear in the RECORD. I take the position that if a Member is not sufficiently interested to make an appearance on the floor of the House, he is not very interested in getting his remarks in the RECORD. I have absolutely no objection and I applaud Members who will take the time to prepare their remarks and have them appear in the RECORD, but frankly, I think it is a sign of laziness for a Member to go through a bunch of periodicals and clip out articles and put two or three sentences with it and put it in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and try to make it appear that it is his own thinking.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am pleased to have that background from the gentleman and thank him very much for yielding to me.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I sat here and listened to the special order just concluded where the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], along with other gentlemen, discussed the tributes to Japanese Americans for their military service in World War II. I was interested in noting that he submitted a number of

unanimous-consent requests to the Speaker, all of which were approved, submitting various speeches, documents, and extraneous material. I am curious to know how you draw the distinction without seeing those documents and without seeing the documents that have been presented by the gentleman from South Dakota, and how you can determine which ones you are going to object to and which ones you are not going to object to. It seems to me this is one of the dangers in censorship.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think you are correct in that respect. I think everyone appreciates the fact that it would be impossible for one person at the beginning of a campaign such as this to get everything in order. I did not object in the instance to which the gentleman referred because it was part of the continuity of the matter that they were speaking on today. I appreciated that fact. But I will say at this time, in similar cases I might object and I am still going to reserve the right to object. The reason I have objected to these requests for extensions at this time and the inclusion of extraneous material is that I do not know what it includes and I think for that reason they should go in the Appendix of the daily RECORD instead.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. I still think the question that was left unanswered about your objection is that you have no objection to matters that are relevant and, yet, you give no—at least I have not heard the gentleman give any guidelines as to what constitutes relevant matter. To give a concrete example, today I asked permission to put into the RECORD a study of the Passamaquoddy project in New England. By necessity I have to include within it reports that have been made by people who have compiled these reports on this type of public power. Would you say that those reports would be extraneous and should not be included or would you in your censorship say that that is relevant; and how am I to know when I make the request whether or not you are going to object to it; or how are the people who handle the Journal or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD going to know whether it meets your standards, if you set up no standards.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would reply to the gentleman in this way. The report that you are talking about, as I have gathered from your statement, is a report and studies that are available in printed records. I think we are making a mistake in duplicating the printing of such material as that.

Mr. MACDONALD. If the gentleman will permit me to correct him, I would point out that they are available in the State of Massachusetts and in the State of Maine and in New Hampshire, but they are not available here for the Members of Congress. I wish to make them available for all the Members from all 50 States so that they can see the justice of the desire to have this project put for-

ward in New England. I do not believe that the Members of the 50 States are going to be that interested that they will write to the New England states to find out the facts and figures which have to do with this project. And, if you think that they are, you are a greater optimist than you have already shown here today, in my judgment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say you are a greater optimist than I would think you to be if you think that the people are going to read it in the RECORD, either.

Mr. MACDONALD. What I would like to know from the gentleman is how the gentleman from Missouri became such an expert in all fields that he sets himself up as a censor without going through any committee of this Congress? By what method does he constitute himself a censor to say what shall or shall not be printed in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that belongs to all the Members of the Congress, and not just to the Member from Missouri?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would only reply to the gentleman that I am operating under the Rules of the House and you have a remedy if you would care to use it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think this thing goes back—and as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing and chairman of the House Committee on Printing—to a rule adopted, and the gentleman from Missouri and I have discussed this and do not agree, I believe, about it, but I think it is worthy of putting it before the Members of the House. Some years ago, as the Members of the House know, the Appendix of the daily RECORD was bound in permanent form. Now the Appendix of the daily RECORD is not bound in permanent form. Therefore, anything that any Member puts in the Appendix of the daily RECORD is not bound up. Formerly it was, and every library in the country got a copy of it. It was preserved in permanent form. I said in the Joint Committee in opposing that if we abolished the privilege, which costs relatively little, then the Members were going to resort to putting anything in the body of the RECORD which really has no relevancy to what happens before and after its appearance in the RECORD, and it would, therefore, be preserved in permanent form for our libraries.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri to the extent that the RECORD of the daily happenings here presumably covers remarks which are made on the floor of the House and that a lot of other things should be in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and such things I would be willing to have placed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. Others would be willing to put in the Appendix of the daily RECORD things they are now putting in the body of the RECORD in order to insure that it is bound up and preserved in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I think this was a mistake on the part of the Joint Committee then

and I think the evidence of it is coming home to us now.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that if we ever have a meeting of the Joint Committee, I could offer a resolution to print and bind up the Appendix of the daily RECORD in permanent fashion and a lot of this material and practice that the gentleman from Missouri considers an abuse—and this is a debatable question—a lot of the things which are now in the body of the RECORD could just as well be placed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I would say that if we ever have a meeting of the Joint Committee—if there is ever one called—we might be able to do something, for what it is worth.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Am I correct in stating that there has not been a meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing this session?

Mr. HAYS. As a member of that committee, if there has been a meeting it has escaped my notice and I have not heard of it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, I think the gentleman is very alert and if there had been such a meeting the gentleman would have been there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] desire to revise his unanimous consent request to state that for those requests in the body of the RECORD which include extraneous matter they shall not exceed 1 page?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I do, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this puts the gentleman from Missouri in a very difficult position—the requirement of the present law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I have been in difficult positions before.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but how can the gentleman possibly know what an article is going to take by way of space once it is set in type or until it is set in type?

How can he possibly know whether it will take a page, a half page, a quarter page, or what?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The people who prepare the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have ways of measuring the typewritten matter and can tell the space it will occupy in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Then, perhaps, we ought to recess and wait until these articles are gone over and are sent to the Government Printing Office and come back at 11 o'clock or 12 o'clock tonight and pass upon them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If that is the will of the House, I will be agreeable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Missouri have any guidelines that he is willing to give the House—and the very few Members of the House who are here whose prerogatives are now being stepped upon—which the gentleman can set forth as to what is relevant material which can be carried in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not prepared at this time to do so; no, sir.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MACDONALD. I withdraw my point of order.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understand correctly the situation before the House, the gentleman has been asked to amend his original unanimous-consent request to insert material in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, provided it does not exceed one page; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The body of the RECORD.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in observing this discussion here today, I shall not quarrel with the desire of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who has certainly done a great job as a Congressman as long as I have been able to observe his actions, during the past 5 years I have been here. But I think we miss one paramount point in this whole discussion. There appears to be a growing tendency in this Congress to deny the individual Member of the House the right to his own best judgment. The gentleman was urged to amend his request today to say that the material shall not exceed one page. Who is going to draw the line? Who shall decide: Should it be one page, should it be a half page, should it be 1 column, should it be 1 paragraph, should it be 10 pages? If we are going to impose restrictions on the judgment of an individual Congressman, then I believe the entire House should adopt proper rules and limitations instead of leaving this decision to the objection of any single Member. Our present rules permit one Member to set himself up as the censor over the entire House.

I do not think the 434 other Members of this body should be subjected solely to the judgment of the gentleman from Missouri, no matter how good his intentions are. I do not think the gentleman from Missouri would want me or anyone else to be passing judgment on his conduct, and I do not think the other Members of the House should be exposed to that sort of treatment.

For this reason I hope the gentleman will not be pressed to change his unanimous-consent request establishing certain limitations on the material that is being submitted by Members who have asked him as their emissary to obtain unanimous consent for their request. I believe the gentleman from Missouri has made his point. I hope he will now offer his views in the form of a resolution to change the rules of the House and per-

mit the entire membership to work its will on the gentleman's observations.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is on the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL]. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore agreed to, the following may be permitted to address the House:

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, on June 12, for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROMWELL, on June 12, for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following other special orders heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Illinois think for one minute that I would not object?

Mr. PRICE. No. I was anticipating.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on June 13, following the legislative business and other special orders heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein extraneous matter.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I objected to that once today and I will object again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein extraneous

matter: Mr. SLACK, Mr. MULTER, Mr. McDOWELL, and Mr. RYAN of New York.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter:

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FARSTEIN.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BRADEMANS.

Mr. RYAN of New York.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. GRABOWSKI.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. McDOWELL.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. HAYS. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALL. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman cannot reserve the right to object when the regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 63, noes 47.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that a quorum is not required on a motion to adjourn.

The House stands adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

920. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the calendar year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

921. A letter from the executive director, U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting the U.S. Olympic Committee financial report for the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 805; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

922. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according to the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 73. A bill to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay; with amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 75. A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, H.R. 5377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 4157. A bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H.R. 134. A bill to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 396. Resolution for con-

sideration of H.R. 6755, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 6908. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6909. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6910. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6911. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6913. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6914. A bill to grant leave with pay for Government personnel engaged in any international athletic competition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 6915. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to extend for a period of 10 years the time during which certain military, naval, and air service records may be corrected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 6916. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1895, to regulate and restrict the printing of certain extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to limit the number of insertions of extraneous matters in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6917. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6918. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the

tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECRET:

H.R. 6920. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize issuance of total disability income provisions to national service life insurance policies through age 65, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6921. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit a limited waiver of service-incurred disabilities in meeting health requirements for reinstatement of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6922. A bill to amend section 723 of title 38, United States Code, to remove time limitation for exchange or conversion of veterans' special term insurance to qualify for special dividend; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 6923. A bill authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 6924. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities, in order to extend for 3 years certain expiring provisions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6925. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6926. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6927. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway linking the Florida Keys with the Tampa Bay area, Florida, as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6928. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6929. A bill to provide that certain functions with respect to housing loans shall be performed by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 6930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the termination provisions for the Federal excise tax on general telephone service, but to allow the taxpayer a credit against such tax for State and local taxes paid by him which are imposed on general telephone service and earmarked for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 6931. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien sons and daughters of World War I veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.R. 6932. A bill to amend section 104 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6933. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organiza-

H.R. 6972. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6973. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6974. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit loans to be made under that act to part-time students in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 468. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 469. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teacher Remembrance Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the World's Fair proposed to be

held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Res. 394. Resolution authorizing salary increases for the file clerk and assistant file clerk (minority); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Res. 395. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the retention in the District of Columbia of a master control record of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN: House Joint Memorial No. 26 of the Oregon State Legislature urging the Congress to appropriate funds to construct access roads through and to Bureau of Land Management lands bordering the Deschutes River and to maintain a portion of the area in a relatively wild or wilderness state; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 6975. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Giuseppe, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6976. A bill for the relief of Peter George Klinklavis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 6977. A bill for the relief of Kyriakos Kyriakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6978. A bill for the relief of the estate of Melville N. Langford, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6979. A bill for the relief of Dr. Panagis Kokolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6981. A bill for the relief of Elvira Maniscalco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6982. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in certain real property in Florida to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 6983. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria, Giuseppe, and Tommaso Santamaria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6984. A bill for the relief of Domenico Fodera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6985. A bill for the relief of Kwang Han Kim, and his wife, Yong Kuk Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 6986. A bill to provide that Capt. Rupert E. Stivers may be granted a commission in the Regular Army, without regard to the restrictions contained in section 3286 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 6987. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo S. Lastrilla, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Middle East Cauldron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last week the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, addressed the 11th Annual Convention of District 1, B'nai B'rith. Senator JAVITS spoke on the difficult situation which exists in the Middle East. As the Senator said in his remarks, the unrest and tension which exists in that area impedes peace not only in the Middle East but in the world. I ask unanimous consent that Senator JAVITS' remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the benefit of his analysis may be available to all.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present crisis in the Middle East is deepening and the danger of war with Is-

rael's existence at stake will not disappear as if by magic just because certain words are said and certain statements pronounced.

U.S. policy in the Middle East continues to be one of "quiet diplomacy" and the Middle East is the only part of the world where U.S. policy treats friends of peace and foes of peace alike. This is an untenable and ill-advised posture for our Nation, and it is time we abandoned it.

With new fighting in Yemen; with Iraq teetering on the brink of civil war with the Kurds once more; and with Nasser's propaganda agitation and subversive activity going at full blast, it will take definite acts by the United States—not unilaterally but together with other nations—to halt the war threat in the Middle East and bring about a climate in which our objectives of peace and stability can be fully realized.

One action that we should take as soon as possible is to tighten up on our aid program to Egypt and make it clear to the President that he should suspend or withhold that assistance altogether if President Nasser continues his aggressive and warlike activities in violation of the express aims and objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I have written to the Department of State to this effect and I shall introduce an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which will emphasize the President's authority to cut off aid to Egypt.

The grave concern felt in the Congress over the rampant hostilities in this region found full expression in the series of speeches and colloquies which took place in the House and the Senate. On April 30, I was joined by 15 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in an attack on the Soviet-Egyptian arms buildup and to call for a sharp change in our present policy of dealing even-handedly with friends and foes of peace alike in the Middle East. It is worth noticing that in 2 hours of discussion and debate on the Senate floor by Democrats and Republicans, not one voice was heard in defense of the State Department's policy in this respect.

We were heartened when President Kennedy, on May 8, issued the firmest and strongest statement on the Middle East he has made since he took office. At that time he told a press conference, and I quote:

"In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

Now this should make it quite clear to President Nasser of Egypt where we stand. But President Nasser has a long memory; he knows that the Department of State does not think he is prepared to act the way he talks, and will react to his threats by giving him as before more economic assistance and