

S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci;

S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes;

S. 1031. An act to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act; and

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America

an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accord-

ance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Civil Rights: Peaceful Change or Social Revolution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered last Friday, July 5, 1963, at an installation of officers meeting of Local 614, Boilermakers Union, New London, Conn. My remarks were devoted primarily to a discussion of the civil rights problems, and my views in dealing with this problem.

The address was as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS: PEACEFUL CHANGE OR SOCIAL REVOLUTION?

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut, before the Boilermakers Union, Local 614, Friday, July 5, 1963, St. Bernard's High School, New London, Conn.)

If any of you think you have problems, I suggest that you consider for a moment the difficulties with which we are faced in Washington, problems on the international scene involving world peace and the security of our Nation, and problems at home which are no less serious. We have a difficult unemployment problem, inadequate housing, an economy that is held back by an outmoded tax structure, substandard educational facilities in many areas, rising hospital costs that worry our 18 million elderly citizens who need the security of medical care, water pollution and air pollution, and many others. But the most difficult of all problems with which we are confronted now is civil rights. I shall come back to that subject in a moment.

We cannot close our eyes and say these problems don't exist. We cannot ignore them and wish they would somehow disappear. We must meet them—and I think we are making sincere efforts to deal with them.

Our Government is making basic efforts to cut into the hard core of unemployment which, as you well know, now totals around 4 million persons. Already our economy is picking up, and I am hopeful that before very long we shall succeed in reducing the number of unemployed.

I would like to see early passage of a tax reduction bill in Congress which should be a great boon to our economy. It will encourage consumers to create new markets. It will encourage business to expand. All of this should help create more jobs.

I would like to see Congress approve the medicare bill to provide a program of health insurance under social security for our senior citizens. They are for the most part people

of limited income, severely pressed by the high cost of living and the high cost of medical care. We must help them maintain a decent and dignified way of life in their declining years.

I would like to see the adoption of legislation to eliminate the classroom shortage in our schools, to pay our teachers more adequate salaries, to assist our colleges in accommodating the growing number of students, and to boost the number of doctors and dentists to provide better health care for our population.

I would like to see the continuation and expansion of our programs which make it possible for more people to own homes, for elderly people to have decent housing, for employees who are displaced by automation to be retrained for other skills, for workers to have a higher minimum wage, for areas eroded by poverty to receive help in rebuilding their economies, for a concentrated attack on air and water pollution, for protection of the American public against harmful drugs, and other programs of direct benefit to the people.

We must recognize that times change. We must also recognize that new problems will raise new challenges, and that new challenges demand new solutions. This great Nation of ours has been characterized throughout its history by its ability to adjust to changes and to meet whatever challenge arises. I am confident that we still have that ability.

Right now we are faced with a tremendous challenge in the field of civil rights. We cannot ignore the fact that we are in the throes of a great social change, some even refer to it as a social revolution.

Just 100 years ago, in 1863, Abraham Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation assuring freedom and equality to all Americans. Now, a century later, some of our citizens are still deprived of these rights. In the South, as well as in other parts of the country, we have seen evidence in recent months of the impatience of the Negro people who are the victims of discrimination and racism. This impatience is expressed in the form of demonstrations, sit-ins, protests, appeals. As yet it has been of a nonviolent character, with a few exceptions. Let us hope it will remain so, for it will indeed be a dark and sad day for America if impatience gives way to riots and bloodshed.

Negro leaders themselves are showing signs of becoming seriously concerned over such developments. Only a few days ago, James Farmer, the national director of CORE—Congress of Racial Equality—one of the leading Negro organizations in the country, stated at the annual convention of the organization: "No one can stop the demonstrations. The question is: Can we keep them orderly and nonviolent?"

This is a matter to which Negro leaders should give much thought. Demonstrations can sometimes get out of control, and the consequences would then be most tragic for all concerned, Negro and white. Not only could it lead to loss of life and destruction of property, but it would alienate the sym-

pathy of millions of white people throughout the country who support civil rights; it would bring much harm to the very cause for which Negroes are fighting and would set that cause back; and it would do irreparable harm to our Nation's prestige abroad. These are factors which should be seriously considered by Negro leaders in their efforts to keep the demonstrations from becoming destructive and violent. This is a responsibility which they must assume.

At the same time, the white people must realize that the Negro is tired of excuses and endless debates. He is alarmed, and even angry at times, when he sees that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation he is still far from obtaining rights of citizenship. He is still struggling for elemental justice, for the right to vote, the right to give his children an education, the right to decent housing, and equal opportunities for advancement in employment. White people, too, must assume their share of responsibility under such circumstances by showing understanding, by avoiding provocation, and by cooperating in the effort to attain civil rights for all Americans.

Let me make one point clear, however. We must recognize the right of Negroes for equal opportunities for obtaining a job, an education, proper housing, and so forth. Denying this right to them is indefensible. But granting a man a job merely because he is a Negro is also indefensible. Merit and ability should be the determining factors, and not the color of a man's skin, or his religious beliefs, or his national origin. All that we ask—and I am sure all that the Negroes themselves ask—is that they be given an equal opportunity, that the same yardstick that is applied to whites in employment, housing, education, public accommodations, and the like, should also be applied to them. That is a fair and just request.

At all levels of Government, Federal, State, county and municipal, we must work to find a peaceful solution to this problem which is without a doubt the overriding moral issue of our day. Americans must realize that the time for excuses and explanations has passed, and that the time for action is here. We must reexamine our sense of moral values and moral objectives. We cannot afford in good conscience to let the struggle of the Negro for true emancipation take place within a nation that seems to have forgotten its own moral values. President Kennedy, in his recent program to Congress on civil rights, has outlined the guidelines for a solution to this problem. Failure to accept this program will weaken the fabric of our Nation at a crucial time in human events when we need our full strength to cope with other domestic and international problems.

As I reflect over the struggle for civil rights, the thought comes to mind: Why this intolerance in this great country of ours toward the member of a minority group, toward the person who belongs to a different race or faith? Did we not all contribute of our brain and brawn to make the United States what it is today? Do we not all seek the security of our country, the welfare of

our Nation? I think of the children born in our country today, who in their formative years know neither prejudice nor hatred of their playmates. They are given by Almighty God inalienable rights of freedom and equality, which neither man nor law can take away from them or deny to them.

A nation that lives up to these rights and provides all of its citizens with the opportunity to enjoy them, is a happy and prosperous nation. A civilization or society that assumes the responsibility that what is granted to one will be granted to all, should have no fear that it cannot survive the onslaught of communism. It cannot be vanquished because its people have something to live by and to fight for.

To me, it stands to reason that in this crucial era for all of humanity this is certainly a time for all men of good will to unite, to set aside their petty bickering, to rise above partisan and geographical lines, and to go forward together in their efforts to achieve security and peace. Unfortunately, the civil rights issue serves to divide us, to weaken us, to arouse sectional strife, and to detract our attention from the real problems and dangers facing our country today. This is exactly what Khrushchev and his comrades in Moscow want—division in our ranks, chaos in our land, and our attention diverted to other matters, while they go about gobbling up nation after nation until we are ready to fall prey to their schemes. We fail to treat a deadly cancer, but worry over a cut on our finger.

This is a time that calls for balanced minds and clear vision to understand the human values behind the struggle for civil rights. It must be clearly understood that second-class citizenship for any segment of our population is no longer feasible or desirable. We have outlived those concepts. The world will no longer tolerate them. If there are any among us who doubt it, I urge you to look at developments in Asia and Africa where many new and independent nations have recently arisen. Just as colonialism is a thing of the past, so discrimination and second-class citizenship status are things of the past.

The sooner we realize this, the better for us. The longer we cling to outmoded concepts, the more we stand to lose.

It was one of your great labor leaders, Samuel Gompers, the founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor, who said:

"America is not merely a name. It is not merely a land. It is not merely a country, nor is it merely a continent. America is a symbol; it is an ideal; the hopes of the world can be expressed in the ideal—America."

That has been true all through our history. That is the image in which mankind has always regarded our Nation—the symbol, the ideal, the hope of humanity. The story of America over the past two centuries is the story of a growing and expanding nation where new opportunities have been opened up to more and more of its citizens, so that they can participate as equal partners in a free society—free also from discrimination. Instead of freedom from discrimination, some sections of our citizenry are suffering from an infection of discrimination which is sapping our strength, stunting our economic growth, and destroying our national unity.

Consider, for example, what discrimination in housing is doing to our cities, the decay it is causing both in human lives and in property. In a book by Howard Moody, called "The City: Metropolis or New Jerusalem?" published just a few months ago—we read as follows:

"A city is dying when it has an eye for real estate value, but has lost its heart for personal values; when it has an understanding of traffic flow, but little concern about the

flow of human beings; when we have increasing competence in building, but less and less time for housing and ethical codes; when human values are absent at the heart of the city's decisionmaking, planning, and the execution of its plans * * * then the city dies and all that is left, humanly, is decay."

Unfortunately, this is the situation in many of our cities today, large and small, where Negroes and others are subject to discrimination in housing and to other indignities. I am opposed to such practices. I am opposed to treating Americans as second-class citizens by denying them basic rights enjoyed by all others. We must not recognize any caste system in the United States or the supremacy of one race over another. Such practices can never be justified in the light of our moral and democratic principles, because there is no moral justification for racial or religious discrimination.

This country is comprised of people from all corners of the earth, all races, religions, and nationality groups. All of them have made important contributions toward the growth of our country and the shaping of its destiny. To abuse our civil rights, to continue discriminatory practices against our fellow citizens, is most injurious to our way of life and to everything that this Nation has stood for and fought for in the last 2 centuries. It is intolerable at all times, it is morally wrong under any circumstances.

Somewhere recently I came across these lines by an American poet:

"Give us wide walls to build our temple of liberty, O God.
The North shall be built of love, to stand against the winds of fate;
The South of tolerance, that we may, in building, outreach hate;
The East our faith, that rises clear and new each day;
The West our hope, that even dies a glorious way.
The threshold 'neath our feet will be humility;
The roof—the very sky itself—infinity.
God, give us wide walls to build this great temple of American liberty."

My friends, for the sake of our great Nation and its future, we must build with love and tolerance; with faith in our country that it will remain the ideal and the hope of mankind, as visualized by Samuel Gompers; and with the firm belief in human brotherhood, freedom, and true understanding among the nations of the world. We cannot be wrong if we are on the side of God and man.

Arms Control and Disarmament Act Needs Larger Authorization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations.

Several identical bills are pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee, as is the bill recently passed by the Senate. The Senate bill is not as favorable to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as some of us had hoped. The Agency

intends to ask for an appropriation of \$15 million for fiscal 1964, and the Senate bill set a ceiling of \$20 million for 1964, and 1965 combined.

The year-and-a-half-old Agency has been the voice of the United States at the Geneva nuclear test ban talks, and the 13 nation disarmament conference. Subjects of its research include detection of underground explosions, the future effect of arms control on the electronics industry in the United States, and the development of international law.

The Agency's work will back up Under-Secretary of State Averell Harriman, in his talks with the British, and Russians in Moscow, starting July 15.

It has been argued that the Agency is still young, and that its growth should be slow. I do not think we can afford this leisure. If we are to find workable plans of arms control and disarmament, and if our negotiators are to be equipped to bargain in such a way as to increase our national security, we need a tremendous amount of research.

Fifteen million dollars a year is a tiny amount compared to our total defense expenditures, and yet the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is one of the most important parts of our defense program.

Beyond the question of dollar amounts, the Agency has asked for an elimination of the appropriation ceiling. The appropriations process would still take place each year, with a thorough review of the Agency's activities. This ceiling elimination would take away any doubt that the Agency's status is permanent, and would therefore be an important expression of this country's intention to persist in seeking carefully considered arms agreements.

Address by Hon. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, Before the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a very informative and effective speech made by the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], to the delegates and members attending the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress that took place at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on June 7, 1963. There is no more dedicated Member of Congress in all fields of legislative activity than the distinguished majority leader.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CARL ALBERT OF OKLAHOMA
Mr. President, and ladies and gentlemen of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, first of all, I would like to bring a word of

greeting from my colleagues in the House of Representatives all of whom are aware of the importance of the leadership which this organization has given to the development of our natural resources and particularly our water resources. Second, I would like to advise that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, would personally have been here to extend a word of greeting and to deliver an address which he had prepared had it not been for illness in his family which required his return to Boston last night. All the Members of the Congress are aware of the impact which the work of this great organization has had upon the development of this country, because it has been during the lifetime of this organization that water conservation and resource conservation generally has become an important and ever-increasingly important fact in American life.

Today the impetus to proceed as quickly as we can with the development of our rivers and harbors in all aspects is proceeding. This means flood control, navigation, improved harbors, power, soil conservation, recreation, and wildlife. All these things, of course, add to the strength and to the opportunities of our American people. I congratulate, personally, this organization upon its work, upon the quality and character of its membership which reaches to every section of the United States and includes among its numbers high-ranking officials of government, State, National and local, and leaders in every walk of life.

In Oklahoma, we have become, as few other States, I think, water conscious. This has been due to several things. First, to the realization that we cannot any longer rely upon a tenant-farmer agricultural economy. Second, to the great leadership that the late Senator Kerr gave to this movement in our State and to the Nation. Bob Kerr, when he died, had reached a position of eminence in Government shared by few other men, in many areas, but the one which was nearest and dearest to his heart was that of the development of water resources, and it is largely because of the impact of his life that the great strides are being made now in my State and in my section of the country.

I am personally devoted to the ideals of this organization. I extend my thanks to you, as a Member of Congress, and my best wishes to you for this conference and for a successful year ahead. Thank you very much.

The Challenge To Our Nation's Defense Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered at the annual eastern regional convention of Submarine Veterans of World War II on Saturday evening, June 29, 1963. Several hundred delegates representing posts in States from Maine to Florida attended the convention which was held in New London, Conn., in my district. In my address I discussed two subjects: the role of the submariner in our national

defense, and the challenge to our Nation's defense today.

It reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, AT THE EASTERN REGIONAL CONVENTION, SUBMARINE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, MOHICAN HOTEL, NEW LONDON, CONN., SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the convention, friends, I am extremely pleased to be here with you this evening and to extend a hearty welcome to all of you. I understand there are delegates here from Maine all the way down to Florida. As the Congressman from this district, I want to tell you that you could not have picked a nicer place for your convention at this time of the year than this fair city of New London. We are very happy to have you.

In my remarks here today I want to discuss with you two subjects. One, the role of the submariner in our national defense. Two, the challenge to our Nation's defense today. I shall be brief on both of these subjects.

During World War I, submarines were used primarily for defensive purposes, such as coastal patrol, attacks on German U-boats to keep shipping lanes open, etc. Although the First World War demonstrated the strategic effectiveness of the submarine, the United States did not start a major submarine building program until 1933 when the Roosevelt administration came into power. By December 1941—at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—we had 111 submarines in commission and 73 under construction. We had 51 active boats in the Pacific, against 83 submarines in the Japanese fleet.

The first attack by an American submarine against a Japanese ship was by the *Swordfish* in the South China Sea on December 9—2 days after Pearl Harbor. While it was never verified the *Swordfish* hit its target, our first real success came 5 days later when the same *Swordfish* sank an enemy ship. In fact, this was the first time in history that an American submarine torpedoed a ship.

During the first year of the war in the Pacific our small but growing fleet of submarines carried out many special missions, such as reconnaissance, evacuation of civilians, running supplies, and transporting commando raiders. No doubt some of you folks present here today participated in such missions.

Only eight of our boats were on full-time anti-ship duty; consequently, we had only limited success in sinking enemy ships. In that first year our boats sank 600,000 tons of enemy shipping—which is a considerable amount—but the total Japanese merchant fleet was estimated at over 6 million tons. As our submarine fleet grew larger, Japanese shipping losses also grew larger and reached a critical stage. Our submarines turned their attention also on Japanese warships, particularly destroyers, a chief enemy of submarines.

It is a fact that more enemy destroyers were sunk by our submarines than by any other means. In all, we know that American submarines destroyed two-thirds of the enemy merchant fleet and one-third of his navy. Let me say at this point, in tribute to the gallant men in our submarine service during World War II, that theirs was an extremely hazardous service with a death rate of about one out of every five men. This is the kind of bravery and heroism for which our Nation is eternally grateful—and in this spirit of appreciation I salute you today.

In World War II we used the submarine in much the same manner as it was used by the Germans in World War I; namely, to cripple the enemy's lifelines on the seas. Since the end of World War II the role of the submarine has changed. Great developments have taken place in submarine technology. There has also been a change in

the potential threat in the development of a large Soviet submarine fleet. This has resulted in an effort to make the submarine an important aspect of anti-submarine warfare. The change or reorientation of our submarine mission began in 1949, when we first realized that the Soviet Union is vastly increasing its submarine fleet and that it constitutes a potential threat to our naval power and sea communications around the world.

That change has been going forward since then. I am sure I am not disclosing any secrets when I tell you that every attack submarine in our Navy today has anti-submarine warfare as a primary mission. These are mainly nuclear-powered ships; they are fast; they are maneuverable; and they have new advanced underwater sensing devices.

There is another role performed by the submarine—a role unheard of even in 1949, less than 15 years ago. I refer to the role of the submarine as a sea-based strategic missile system. The latest in submarine technology, combined with the most advanced missile development, produced the Polaris-firing nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarine. We now have 12 such submarines in commission, and 23 under construction or authorized for construction—a total of 35 of these submarines. May I add that these figures were given me by the Navy Department and they are not classified. Thus you can see that we are gradually building up the most formidable offensive second-strike deterrent weapons in existence.

And these is another change to be noted here—a change that is no less important. I refer to the life and the role of the submariner today which has also changed greatly. Although there is the same informality among the officers and men, the same esprit de corps as in the past, living conditions have improved and the technical demands on the crew are much higher. Being constantly submerged for 60 days is the standard patrol of the Polaris submarines. The old submarines designed in the 1920's and used in World War II could stay submerged under the most favorable conditions for 24 hours. They were noisy, poorly ventilated, cramped for space, and always in need of repair. On modern submarines space is still at a premium, but much more attention has been given to comfort and surroundings, and the air is purer.

Even though it is peacetime and underwater patrols are much longer than before, we have more men who volunteer for submarine service than we can accept. The training is much more rigorous today. The enlisted man on the ballistic missile submarine requires about 6 months duty both ashore and at sea before he can attain qualification status. The officer requires a whole year. Engineering personnel get an additional 13 months of schooling. These men are highly trained technicians in a perpetual training process to master their jobs and the ever-changing equipment.

There must be something to a service which can arouse so much interest and devotion, so much loyalty and heroism, both in time of war and in time of peace, as the submarine service. You men who have been in it, and those who followed you, deserve recognition for the sacrifice and the patriotism you have demonstrated. Yours is not the patriotism of merely marching behind a band or lighting fireworks one day in the year. It is much more than that. It is the very defense of the flag and the Nation, of which you are a part; it is the spirit of the people who unselfishly devoted themselves to the cause of freedom. Your patriotism is the love for your country, the respect for its traditions, the honor of its people. Your patriotism was standing tall and unafraid against all enemies, ready to sacrifice oneself, if need be.

So much for the role of the submarine and submariner. Now, let us turn to our second

topic, the challenge to our Nation's defenses today.

Several days ago, we passed in the House of Representatives the defense appropriation bill which provided \$47 billion for our Nation's defenses in the coming year. I must admit that when my name was called and I voted "yea" for the bill, I felt a certain degree of excitement. After all, I am voting to spend a tremendous amount of the taxpayers' money. This is no small sum—\$47 billion is just about half of the country's entire budget. And that in itself shows you how much of our expenditures is used for defense purposes. This is one need where we cannot and dare not economize, because the security of the Nation is most important to us all.

This is the legislation which enables the United States to maintain its position of military superiority over the Soviet Union. I can assure you that the military strength of the United States has reached an all time high—it is greater today than ever before. True, military strength in itself will not necessarily insure peace, but insofar as such strength can serve to avert and deter war, our country has what it takes. And that should be an encouraging factor to all of us here and to peace-loving people all over the world.

The primary object of our defense program is to deter war and to support all efforts for peace. There will undoubtedly be small-scale, limited wars, and perhaps even somewhat larger general wars in one part of the world or another. This is something we must learn to live with in the modern world. We cannot rule them out, but we can and definitely will exert every effort to make sure that they do not spread into a new world conflagration. Both sides are keenly aware that a global war would mean suicide for the whole human race. While both have developed weapons of total destruction, we pray that reason will prevail and the world will remain at peace.

But we cannot afford to sit idly back and to wait for events to take shape, and then merely react to them. We cannot close our eyes to the deception, the conspiracies and the subversion practiced by communism all over the world, including 90 miles from our shores in Cuba. In the light of such Communist tactics and activities everywhere, we must ask ourselves: Is the world any calmer today than it was a year or two ago? Is there less chance for Communist aggression against the free world today? I don't think so. I do not believe that they have changed their aims one iota—they are still out to conquer the world. They may differ on tactics, but the goal remains the same.

This is the challenge that we, as a Nation, face today on a global scale. In dealing with this challenge, we have begun to reorient our strategy and our tactics during the past two and a half years under the Kennedy administration, so as to correspond with the hard facts of international developments. We are doing it in three ways, or perhaps more correctly on three fronts.

First is our atomic power. We must continue to rely on nuclear weapons, even if it is for the purpose of convincing a would-be aggressor that he could not emerge victorious in a war of his own instigation. We do not want any miscalculation in this respect. Any potential adversary of the United States should know that we have such weapons, that we have them in large supply, and that we are keeping them up to date. We want the rest of the world to know, however, that we will not use our atomic power, except in certain emergencies and under certain circumstances. We shall use such power only as a last resort, after all human logic and reason will have been exhausted or flagrantly ignored by a cocky aggressor.

Second is our conventional power. We must retain this power. Although conventional weapons play a less dominant role in the modern world, we cannot allow such power to diminish. On the contrary, we are continuing to strengthen our conventional weapons and to increase our Ready Reserve of trained manpower. If we do not have this power, we may someday be faced with a nightmarish choice: Either resort to the use of all-out nuclear retaliation, or retreat. I hope we are never confronted with such a choice.

The growth in our conventional strength is also important for the small-scale, sagebrush wars which break out from time to time in various countries at the instigation of the Communists. We cannot, nor do we wish to, use nuclear weapons in such instances. For many of the smaller nations associated with us in the struggle against international communism, the fact that we are increasing our conventional forces should be encouraging news. It will assure effective support in dealing with Communist subversion, provocation, and conspiracies.

Third is the power provided by our guerrilla forces. These forces are not only growing in number and steadily improving their counterinsurgency tactics, but I can tell you that this is becoming a most important factor in our defense picture. In the last 2 years the United States has tripled its anti-guerrilla forces, and I can assure you that they will be further increased in the coming years. This, too, is an effort in the direction of preventing or confining limited wars and acts of subversion, and as such it will help strengthen and improve the military defense of our friends abroad in accordance with their needs.

These, then, are three fronts on which we are active today in reorienting our military strategy and tactics. These three types of power—atomic, conventional, and guerrilla—provide the leaders of our Nation with a flexibility of decision as to when to use any of these forces, and also which of these forces should be applied to deal with a particular situation or challenge.

We are not a nation to start a war, but we want to be sure that we shall have all possible power needed for any emergency. I feel confident that in a test of strength, we would ultimately prevail and emerge victorious. But this should not stop us from seeking a peaceful solution to international problems and the attainment of genuine peace for all mankind. Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric stated our position very clear when he said about a year ago: "Those who would impose a totalitarian world order and deny men and nations the right to pursue their own destinies should understand one point very clearly. The United States does not seek to resolve disputes by violence. But if forceful interference with our rights and obligations shall lead to violent conflict—as it well might—the United States does not intend to be defeated."

All of us are deeply concerned about the security of our country, the security of the whole free world. We want our Nation to remain strong and free and united in order to be able to meet any challenge or any threat to destroy us. The nations of the world look to us for guidance and leadership in this crucial period of human affairs. We must give it to them. We must provide the strength, the ideas, the unity, and the action in the struggle against communism. We must have faith in our Nation and faith in ourselves. We must have leadership by men of strong faith and vision to look ahead.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish," the Bible tells us. Let us remember that admonition. The future of our Nation is at stake.

I want to conclude with the following by an unknown author:

"I asked God for strength, that I might achieve;

I was made weak, that I might learn humbly to obey.

I asked for health, that I might do greater things;

I was given infirmity, that I might do better things.

I asked for riches, that I might be happy;

I was given poverty, that I might be wise.

I asked for power, that I might have the praise of men;

I was given weakness, that I might feel the need of God.

I asked for all things, that I might enjoy life;

I was given life that I might enjoy all things.

I got nothing that I asked for, but everything I had hoped for;

Almost despite myself, my unspoken prayers were answered.

I am, among all men, most richly blessed."

My friends, we too in this country can truthfully say that our prayers were answered, that among all men and all nations we are most richly blessed. We have been endowed by our Creator with a wonderful people, a beautiful land, great resources, and the best example in all history of a just government by law. Let's make sure that we keep it that way.

Congressional Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, continuing reorganization of Government for reasons other than accommodation of power rivals is a necessity in democratic societies. Popular compromise legislation inevitably creates inefficient laws and procedures. Can a democratic government reorganize itself at anything like the speed with which it disorganizes itself? Our future depends on an affirmative answer. To take initiative in this field and to deserve the right to make meaningful demands on the executive and judicial branches, Congress must begin with its own administration. Following is a bibliography which I have obtained from the Library of Congress dealing with books and articles dealing with this subject:

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION, SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY BOOKS

Acheson, Dean G., "A Citizen Looks at Congress." New York: Harper, 1956. 124 pp. JK 1061 .A64.

American Political Science Association. Committee on Congress. "The Reorganization of Congress." Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1945. 89 pp. JK 1096 .As.

American Political Science Association. Committee on Political Parties. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System"; a report. New York: Rinehart, 1950. 99 pp. JK 2265 .A7.

- Bailey, Stephen K., and Howard D. Samuel, "Congress at Work." New York: Holt, 1952. 502 pp. JK 1061 .B3.
- Burdette, Franklin L., "Fillbustering in the Senate." Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. 252 pp. JK 1274 .B87.
- Burnham, James, "Congress and the American Tradition." Chicago: Regnery, 1959. 363 pp. JK 1061 .B78.
- Burns, James MacGregor, "Congress on Trial: The Legislative Process and the Administrative State." New York: Harper, 1949. 224 pp. JK 1061 .B8.
- Burns, James MacGregor, "The Deadlock of Democracy; Four-Party Politics in America." Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963. 388 pp. E 183 .B96.
- Dangerfield, Royden James, "In Defense of the Senate; A Study in Treatymaking." Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1933. 365 pp. JK 1170 .D3.
- Galloway, George B., "Congress and Democracy; a Lecture Delivered at the Ohio State University, February 27, 1950" (Walter J. Shepard Foundation lectures).
- Galloway, George B., "Congress and Parliament: Their Organization and Operation in the U.S. and the U.K." Washington: National Planning Association, 1955. 105 pp. JK 1021 .G3 (or) HC 101.N352 No. 93.
- Galloway, George B., "Congress at the Crossroads." New York: Crowell, 1946. JK 1061 .G3.
- Galloway, George B., "Congressional Reorganization Revisited." College Park: Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Maryland, 1956. 26 pp. JK 1061 .G314.
- Galloway, George B., "Congressional Reorganization: Unfinished Business." In Earl Latham (Ed.), the philosophy and politics of Woodrow Wilson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. pp. 214-27. E 767 .L3.
- Galloway, George B., "History of the House of Representatives." New York: Crowell, 1962. 334 pp. JK 1316 .G2.
- Galloway, George B., "The Legislative Process in Congress." New York: Crowell, 1953. 669 pp. JK 1061 .G32.
- Galloway, George B., "Next Steps in Congressional Reform." Urbana: University of Illinois, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, 1952. 32 pp. JK 1061 .G33.
- Griffith, Ernest S., "Congress: Its Contemporary Role." 3rd edition New York: New York University Press, 1961. 244 pp. JK 1061 .G7 1961.
- Gross, Bertram M., "The Legislative Struggle, a Study in Social Combat." New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953. 472 pp. JK 1096 .G7.
- Harris, Joseph P., "The Advice and Consent of the Senate." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953. 457 pp. JK 1274 .H3.
- Hazlitt, Henry, "A New Constitution Now." New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942. 297 pp. JK 268 .H36.
- Heubel, Edward J., "Reorganization and Reform of Congressional Investigations, 1945-55." Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1956. Microfilm AC-1 no. 15, 930.
- Holcombe, Arthur N., "Our More Perfect Union; From Eighteenth-Century Principles To Twentieth-Century Practice." Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. 460 pp. JK 31 .H7.
- Horn, Stephen, "The Cabinet and Congress." New York: Columbia University Press, 1960. JK 616 .H6.
- Hyneman, Charles S., "Bureaucracy in a Democracy." New York: Harper, 1950. 586 pp. JK 421 .H8.
- Jewell, Malcolm E., "Senatorial Politics and Foreign Policy." Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962. 214 pp. E 744 .J4.
- Kammerer, Gladys M., "Congressional Committee Staffing Since 1946." Lexington: Bureau of Government Research, University of Kentucky, 1951. 65 pp. JK 1029 .K3.
- KEFAUVER, ESTES, and Jack Levin. "A Twentieth-Century Congress." New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1947. 236 pp. JK 1081 .K4.
- Kofmehl, Kenneth T., "Professional Staffs of Congress." West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University [Studies: Humanities Series], 1962. 282 pp. JK 1083 .K6.
- McNeill, Neil, "Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives." New York: McKay, 1963. 496 pp. JK 1331 .M2.
- Millsbaugh, Arthur C., "Toward Efficient Democracy; the Question of Governmental Organization." Washington: Brookings, 1949. 307 pp. JK 271 .M5.
- MONRONEY, A. S. MIKE, et al. "The Strengthening of American Political Institutions." Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1949. 134 pp. JK 271 .S893.
- Ogul, Morris S., "Reforming Executive-Legislative Relations in the Conduct of American Foreign Policy: The Executive-Legislative Council as a Proposed Solution." Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1958. [Thesis, University of Michigan] 1921.
- Kraines, Oscar, "Congress and the Challenge of Big Government." New York: Bookman Associates, 1958. 129 pp. JK 643 .B87K7.
- Riddick, Floyd M., "The United States Congress; Organization and Procedure." Manassas, Va.: National Capitol Publishers, 1949. 449 pp. JK 1096 .R54.
- Robinson, James A., "Congress and Foreign Policy-Making: A Study in Legislative Influence and Initiative." Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962. 262 pp. JK 1081 .R6.
- Truman, David B., "The Governmental Process; Political Interests and Public Opinion." New York: Knopf, 1953. 544 pp. JK 1118 .T7.
- U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration. "Rules of Procedure for Senate Investigating Committees." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Rules, 83d Cong., 2d sess. 10 parts. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954. 10 pts., 663 pp. JK 1274 .A4 1954.
- U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration. "Rules of Procedure for Senate Investigating Committees." Report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955. 43 pp. JK 1274 .A4 1955.
- Wallace, Robert A., "Congressional Control of Federal Spending." Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960. 188 pp. HJ 2052 .W3.
- Willoughby, William F., "Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration." Washington: Brookings Institution, 1934. 657 pp. JK 1061 .W7.
- Wilson, H. Hubert, "Congress; Corruption and Compromise." New York: Rinehart, 1951. 337 pp. JK 1061 .W72.
- Young, Roland, "The American Congress." New York: Harper, 1958. 333 pp. JK 1061 .Y59.
- ARTICLES
- Baker, Russell W., "Paralysis on the Hill: The Declining Prestige and Power of Congress Stem From Its Inability and Unwillingness To Meet Its Responsibilities Toward National Issues." Johns Hopkins Magazine, 14: 4-5 plus (January 1963).
- Bendiner, Robert, "Just How Bad is Congress?" Commentary 13: 135-41 (February, 1952).
- Broughton, Phillip S., "Congress is Far From Reorganized." New York Times Magazine. May 18, 1947, p. 7 plus.
- Broughton, Phillip S., "For a Stronger Congress." New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1946. 32 p.
- Carter, Hodding, "Speaking Out: Let's Keep the Filibuster." Saturday Evening Post, 235: 10 plus (June 16, 1962).
- CELLER, EMANUEL, "The Seniority Rule in Congress." Western Political Quarterly, 14, pt. 1: 160-67 (March 1961).
- Chamberlain, Lawrence H., "Congress, Diagnosis and Prescription." Political Science Quarterly, 60: 437-45 (September 1945).
- CLARK, JOSEPH S., "Hesitant Senate." Atlantic, 209: 55-60 (March 1962). Reply: BARRY GOLDWATER, 209: 36 plus (May 1962).
- Congressional Quarterly Almanac (Annual) Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service. 194—Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service. "Congressman: For 2 Years, or 4?" Senior Scholastic, 73: 8-9, 28 (September 19, 1958).
- Coyle, David Cushman, "Reorganizing Congress." Virginia Quarterly Review, 24: 13-26 (Winter, 1948).
- Daniels, Jonathan, "What Truman Would Do To Congress." Colliers, April 14, 1951: pp. 13-15, 54-55.
- Drummond, Roscoe, "Speaking Out: Congress Must Reform." Saturday Evening Post, 238: 8 plus (February 9, 1963).
- "The Filibuster Debate: Barrier Against Steamrollers," by Lindsay Rogers; "The Public Business Must Go Forward," by Jacob K. JAVRS. Reporter, 20: 21-25 (January 8, 1959).
- FULBRIGHT, J. WILLIAM, "American Foreign Policy in the 20th Century Under an 18th Century Constitution." Cornell Law Quarterly, (Fall 1961).
- Galloway, George B., "The Operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946." American Political Science Review, 45: 41-68 (March 1951).
- Galloway, George B., "To Break the Congress Long-Jam." New York Times Magazine (July 26, 1953).
- Gallup, George H., "Editors for Congress: Single Term Proposed to Attract Outstanding Citizens." National Municipal Review, 47: 210-15 (May 1958).
- Goodwin, George Jr., "The Seniority System in Congress." American Political Science Review, 53: 41-36 (June 1959). (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS-107.)
- Goodwin, George, Jr., "Subcommittees: The Miniature Legislatures of Congress." American Political Science Review, 56: 596-604 (September 1962).
- Greenberg, D. S., "Science and Congress: Machinery Is Out of Date for Handling \$12 Billion in Research Programs." Science, October 19, 1962, pp. 417-418.
- HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "Modernizing Congress—Pressure Forcing Congress To Consider Modernizing Its Ways for the First Time in 17 Years." American Federationist, 70: 1-4 (April 1963).
- HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "The Senate on Trial." American Political Science Review, 44: 650-660 (September 1950).
- HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "To Move Congress Out of Its Ruts." New York Times Magazine, p. 39 plus, April 7, 1963.
- Hyman, Sidney, "Inquiry Into the 'Decline' of Congress." New York Times Magazine, January 3, 1960, pp. 5, 38-41.
- "Is Congress Doing Its Job?" With editorial comment. Business Week, 48-57, 92 (January 5, 1963).
- Jones, Charles O., "The Role of the Congressional Subcommittee." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6: 327-44 (November 1962).
- KEFAUVER, ESTES, "Congressional Reorganization." Journal of Politics. 9: 96-107 (February 1947).
- KEFAUVER, ESTES, "Did We Modernize Congress?" National Municipal Review. 36: 552-57 (November 1947).
- KEFAUVER, ESTES, "What's To Be Done About Congress." New York Times Magazine. September 11, 1949; pp. 9-10 plus.
- Kennedy, John F., "Congressional Lobbies: A Chronic Problem Reexamined." Georgetown Law Journal 45: 535-67 (Summer, 1957).
- Kolodziej, E. A., "Minority Rule as a Rule." New Republic, 148: 8-10 (January 12, 1963).

Kristol, Irving, "Democracy and Babel." "There has not been a 'great debate' on any public question since 1920", not in the mass media, certainly not in Congress, says the author. Columbia University Forum, 3: 15-19 (Fall 1960).

Latest efforts to change U.S. Senate's cloture rule 22. Congressional Digest (entire issue) (December 1958).

"Liberals seek short-cut through Congress." Nation's Business, November, 1962, pp. 36-37, 78.

Lyon, Carl V., and William H. Stamhagen, "Lobbying, Liberty, and the Legislative Process: An Appraisal of the Proposed Legislative Activities Disclosure Act." George Washington Law Review 26: 391-417 (March 1958).

McCartney, J., "Senate Establishment; Concerning Senator CLARK's Remarkable Speech." Nation, 196: 219-21 (March 16, 1963).

McCLELLAN, JOHN L., "A New Watchdog Agency for Congress." [Tax Foundation] Tax Review, 18: 55-18 (December 1957).

Mantel, Howard N., "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Fact or Fiction of the Legislative Process?" Western Political Quarterly, 12: 981-95 (December 1955).

Morley, Felix, "Deliberate Pace in Congress Safeguards Your Rights." Nation's Business, 51: 27-28 (March 1963).

Morley, Felix, "Too Much Legislative Reform is as Dangerous as Too Little." Nation's Business (July 1962, pp. 25-26).

Needler, Martin, "On the Dangers of Copying From the British." Political Science Quarterly, 77: 379-96 (September 1962).

Neuberger, Richard L., "Who Polices the Policemen (Congress)?" New York Times Magazine, February 23, 1958: 18, 79-80, 82.

Parkins, Ivan W., "Let's Disassemble the House." South Atlantic Quarterly, 59: 226-38 (Spring, 1960).

Pertain, Eugene G., "The Use of Broadcast Media in Congressional, Legislative, and Quasi-Judicial Proceedings." Journal of Broadcasting, 4: 123-39 (Spring, 1960).

Perlmutter, O. W., "Acheson vs. Congress." Review of Politics, 22: 5-44 (January 1960).

Riker, William H., "The Paradox of Voting and Congressional Rules for Voting on Amendments." American Political Science Review, 52: 349-66 (June 1958). (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS 239).

Robinson, James A., "The Role of the Rules Committee in Arranging the Program of the U.S. House of Representatives." Western Political Quarterly, 12: 653-69 (September 1959). (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS 241).

Rogers, Lindsay, and JACOB K. JAVITS, "The Filibuster Debate." Reporter, 20: 21-23 (January 8, 1959).

Schattschneider, E. E., "Congress in Conflict." Yale Review 41: 181-93 (Winter, 1952).

Scher, Seymour, "Congressional Committee Members as Independent Agency, Overseers: A Case Study." American Political Science Review, 54: 911-20 (December 1960).

Shannon, William V., "Liberal Hopes and Congress Realities." Commentary, 27: 405-12 (May 1959).

Shuman, Howard E., "Senate Rules and the Civil Rights Bill." American Political Science Review, 51: 955-75 (December 1957).

Shuman, Howard E., "What's the Matter With Congress?" New Republic (April 1, 1957, pp. 14-16).

"That 'Streamlined' Congress: One Reform of Our Legislative Machinery Wasn't Enough. So Let's Try Again." (Editorial) Life 23: 30 (July 28, 1947).

Udall, Stewart L., "A Congressman Defends the House." New York Times Magazine, January 12, 1958: 14, 69, 72.

"Uncreative, Negative, Smug; Is This Today's U.S. Congress?" Newsweek, 61: 22-24 (January 28, 1963).

U.S. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Subcommittee on Standing

Rules of the Senate. Proposed amendments to the standing rules of the Senate. Hearing, June 16, 1961, on Senate Resolution 9 [and other resolutions] and Senate Resolution 10 and Senate Resolution 14, proposed amendments to the Legislative reorganization act of 1946. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961. 50 pp. [87th Cong., 1st sess.]

U.S. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Adjournment of Congress: Hearing, August 2, 1961, on Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, providing for annual adjournments of Congress and Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, to establish a date for adjournment of Congress. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961. 26 pp. [87th Cong., 1st sess.]

Vardys, V. Stanley, "Select committees of the House of representatives—their establishment, constitution, and purposes." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6: 247-65 (August 1962).

Wallace, Robert A., "Congressional Control of the Budget." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 3: 151-67 (May 1959) (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS -293).

"What's wrong with Congress?" U.S. News & World Report, 49: 56-77 (September 12, 1960).

White, Goring, "To the Rescue of Congress." National Review, 5: 206-07 (March 1, 1958).

White, William S., "In Defense of Congressional Investigations." Harper's, 220: p. 94 plus (April 1960).

Wicker, Tom, "Again That Roadblock in Congress." New York Times Magazine, August 7, 1960. pp. 14, 64, 68-9.

Young, Stephen M., "Washington's Conflict of Interest Mess." Coronet, 46: 76-83 (September 1959).

Mr. Speaker, one of the bills which has my support as part of a long-range congressional reform program is the following bill which is currently being considered in committee:

H.R. 1947

A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Commission on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) to be composed of seven Members of the Senate (not more than four of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, seven Members of the House of Representatives (not more than four of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two members with distinguished records of interest in public affairs to be appointed by the President of the United States without regard to political affiliation. The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the Commission except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying and expediting its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two

Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, select, and conference committees of the Congress, the rules, parliamentary procedure practices, and/or precedents of either House, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, and the consolidations and reorganization of committees and committee jurisdictions.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

(b) The Commission is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the Commission which shall not exceed \$ _____, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(d) The Commission shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than four months after the Commission is established. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the Commission shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on Government Operations of the House.

Invitation to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, the most serious diseases which threatened the lives of the people could not always be diagnosed by physicians. Effective means of preventing the contagion from spreading were often extremely difficult to prescribe.

Much the same danger threatens the freedom and vital interests of the American people today because it is not easily diagnosed and because our common enemy takes many uncommon shapes.

Recognizing the threat to our security, we have stockpiled reserves of nuclear weapons; we have spared no expense in our efforts to be first in the conquest of space and related technology; we have contributed more than \$100 billion in aid to 98 countries and territories over the past 15 years to strengthen our barriers against Communist aggression.

And yet, there are many who believe we are no safer or nearer our goal which is the preservation of life in peace and justice for ourselves and all the world.

Why this feeling of uneasiness and insecurity? Because, in our determination not to be the first power to unleash the hurricane winds of nuclear war, many are not always able to recognize the strategy of those who announce openly, "We shall bury you."

There are very few people in the world today who have as thorough a knowledge of enemy strategy than Zbigniew Stypulkowski, author of an excellent book titled, "Invitation to Moscow" who presently is visiting the United States.

Mr. Stypulkowski, once a prominent lawyer in Warsaw and the youngest Member ever elected to Poland's Parliament, rose to be one of the national leaders of Poland in her fight against the invasions of Hitler and Stalin during World War II. In March 1945, with 15 other members of the Polish underground government, he was invited by Stalin to come to Moscow for negotiations concerning future relations between the Polish people and the Soviets based on the newly signed Yalta Agreement.

When the Western governments learned of this invitation, they urged that it be accepted because they saw in it the salvation of Poland and a token of good will on the part of the Soviet Government. It was all, however, a typical Stalin fraud. The Polish leaders including Mr. Stypulkowski, were kidnapped to Moscow and jailed in the infamous Lubianka prison.

Stypulkowski was submitted to 141 interrogations in the course of 70 days and nights and then sentenced by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. He never broke down and never admitted "guilt." Rudenko, the present Soviet Attorney General, told him at the conclusion of the investigation:

It will be the first time since the Soviet revolution that a defendant tried in the Supreme Court of Justice of the U.S.S.R. has not pleaded guilty. Do you think you are acting wisely?

Eventually, Stypulkowski regained his freedom and is now in the West. He rendered a great service not only to his country but also to the cause of the defense of the free world when, in 1951, he published his book, "Invitation to Moscow." This book, now translated in many languages, based not on theory but on personal, practical experience gives a masterful description of the nature and the effects of the Stalin brainwashing technique.

"Invitation to Moscow" is now being quoted in scientific, political, sociological and medical literature throughout the world. When it was published in 1951, Newsweek wrote about it as follows:

Throws an amazingly vivid light upon modern Russia. * * * So enlightening as to be almost essential for an understanding of the modern world.

The noted British statesman, Richard H. S. Crossman, wrote in "New Statesman and Nation":

One of the most remarkable documents I have ever read. * * * Makes Koestler's "Darkness at Noon" sound like a clever pastiche.

I will also quote John Connell from London Evening News:

I hail his courage, his honesty, his humility and his quenchless faith; and I urge everyone to read this book. * * *

In 1954 the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, appointed by the House of Representatives, had a long interview with Mr. Stypulkowski in London. His evidence aroused a most vivid interest among the members of the committee. I quote some of their opinions from the official record of the meeting:

Congressman Fred E. Busbey of Illinois. I personally think that your testimony today is without a doubt probably the best testimony on this particular subject * * * that has been brought to the attention not only of the congressional committee but also of the entire free world.

Congressman RAY MADDEN of Indiana. I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Stypulkowski's testimony is so valuable that * * * it could be used very advantageously by this committee and by our Government.

Congressman Thaddeus Machrowicz of Michigan. Most of the testimony he [Mr. Stypulkowski] has given today is contained in a splendid book which he has written, "Invitation to Moscow," and I think it would be well if we were to make it compulsory reading for anyone who accepts, or is offered, an invitation to Geneva, Berlin, or anywhere else to deal with the Communists."

Congressman THOMAS DODD of Connecticut. It, this book, certainly ought to be a valuable contribution to everyone's understanding about the situation.

The CHAIRMAN (Congressman Kersten). Mr. Stypulkowski * * * you have made a great contribution, and I particularly think that you underlined a feature which is most important for us to consider.

A few months ago, there appeared a new edition of the book "Invitation to Moscow," published by Walker & Co. This gave me the opportunity to re-read it and to review its meaning. I am following the advice of those whose statements I have quoted, and I call upon every thinking American to become acquainted with the contents of this book. I recommend our educational institutions, armed services, information services, make the book "Invitation to Moscow" accessible to all Americans, as well as those foreign societies toward which Communist "brainwashing" is mainly directed.

In support of my opinion, may I be permitted to recall that two outstanding Members of Congress in 1951-52, introduced for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recommendation regarding "Invitation to Moscow." They were: President Kennedy and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

I would hope that our military leaders would heed the wise counsel of President Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon by making "Invitation to Moscow" required reading for all of our troops.

For, if we refrain from exposing and critically examining the published techniques of Communist strategy and if we neglect to instill the virtues of patriotism, religious feeling, and a deep-rooted sense of honor in our people we will not achieve the peace and justice for which we yearn and which we owe to future generations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, away from Thee, we dwell in darkness and death. In the midst of world conditions that baffle us, swift social currents which sweep away our strongest bulwarks, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us; we must find a strength not our own, or our feet will slip in this whelming flood.

To Thy sustaining grace in this halloved moment we would lift up the

thronging questions which haunt us day and night, the grievous problems affecting and afflicting Thy children in all the world, for which our human wisdom finds no answer.

We pray that Thou wilt gird us to heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might in these momentous times. Spurning and scorning the poisonous weeds in the garden of democracy, may we rejoice only in the fair and fragrant virtues of honor untarnished.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 10, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its