cooperative effort he accompanied by the prevention of Federal ownership and operation of the line from the Columbia River to Hoover Dam. Such a line would insure the prevention of monopolistic practices by the private electric utilities.

Prevention of private power monopoly activities necessitates simultaneous construction by the Federal Government of the line to Hoover Dam. According to the plans of the Secretary of the Interior, this particular line would be scheduled for completion in 1971—long after completion of the other three proposed lines into California. Being a realist, I fear that this line, if constructed after the private utility lines and after the completion of the city of Los Angeles line, would never be constructed by the Federal Government. This fear is based upon years of experience in dealing with the activities of private utilities. They have long sought to control, for profit, the public power generated at multipurpose dams built with the taxpayers' money.

My apprehension concerning the Columbia River-Hoover Dam line is heightened by this statement appearing in the fact sheet issued by the Secretary of the Interior:

If the Congress desires that the Department of the Interior call for non-Federal proposals but that the line be in the case of the lines to California, we can see no objection to such a procedure.

The same assertion was repeated in the question-and-answer sheet attached to the Secretary's press release accompanying the report. I note also that on page 25 of the report there appears a similar statement. These sentences can be construed as an escape hatch which could vitiate the merits of the proposed package.

The Senate Committee can provide the safeguard I have just suggested if it will recommend that Congress appropriate and direct the expenditure of funds for the fiscal year 1965, to state and to the extent of $50,000,000 direct-current line from the Columbia River to Hoover Dam.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of having proper electric power yardstick protection in connection with the intertie. In this respect, I am reminded that recently a top private power company executive of the Pacific Northwest was quoted quite candidly in the Wall Street Journal as saying, "Who controls the power controls the works." If we give the private utilities either direct or indirect control of the transmission of power under the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, we might just as well turn over to them the bus bar the power generated at our great multipurpose dam.

One additional safeguard is needed in this instance: I allude to the importance of an appropriation by the Congressional committee an opportunity to examine in minute detail the contracts eventually worked out between the private electric utilities and the Government, relating to power generated over the proposed alternating current lines into California. Also, the committees should have an opportunity to give searching examination to the contract the Government eventually works out with the city of Los Angeles, for the direct-current transmission of power on the third intertie line. I suggest that these contracts be transmitted to the appropriate committees, and that a period of at least 60 days be given the committees to examine the contracts, to assure that proper safeguards for the taxpayers and electric power ratepayers are inherent in them.

In closing, I repeat what I said in the Senate on June 29—namely, that we should scrutinize any intertie proposal from this standpoint. What assurance do we have that the private utilities will give us fair agreements for the wheeling, over their transmission lines, of the power that is generated at dams owned by the American people? We are confronted with a legislative problem when we sanction an intertie arrangement, and when we associate ourselves with the private utilities the working out of the agreements in regard to the wheeling of the power and the protection of public-preference customers. We should carry our full legislative responsibility in this respect.

TWO PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1023, H.R. 287, that is, the bill before the Senate and the making of the pending business. There will be no action taken on it. It is merely for the purpose of having some business pending on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—H.R. 287—to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 6, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2, 1964:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Wilson Cowen, of Maryland, to be chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE


DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 142.

U.S. ARMY

Gen. Barzdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be present on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.


The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066:


HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The words of Scripture inscribed on our Liberty Bell—Leviticus 25: 10: 'Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.' The truth which our fathers and their succeeding generations, may our beloved Nation, conceived in sacrifice and dedicated to liberty, inspire and sustain us in our glorious mission of helping to release the hidden splendor of humanity and in leading all mankind into the radiant light of a brighter and better day.

Grant that our American democracy, with its patriotism and love of freedom, may continue to be an inspiration to that moral and spiritual truth that we must hold fast to in our day. May we have the greatest respect for the dignity of man, whom Thou hast created in Thine own image and hast endowed with certain inalienable rights which we will safeguard.

On the coming day, may we remember with our tribute of gratitude and praise those great patriots who stated in verbal form their inimitable faith and deepest convictions by signing the Declaration of Independence, and by dedicating to the cause of freedom their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace and may the legislation which we enact here today be in accord with Thy divine will for our beloved country. 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. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to amendments to the bill (H.R. 4364) entitled...
“An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University,” disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. COWER to be the conferences on the part of the Senate.

WORK PLANS APPROVED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

H.R. 769. THE Speaker. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

1. Blackstone River, Rhode Island.
2. Waterford Creek, Michigan.
3. Catskill Creek, New York.
4. Hiawassee River, Georgia.
5. Hiwassee River, Tennessee.
7. Sandy River, Oregon.
8. Mississippi River, Missouri.
10. Savannah River, South Carolina.
12. Muddy Creek, Kansas.
13. Portage Creek, Indiana.
17. Escambia River, Florida.
20. Ohio River, Kentucky.

Sincerely yours,

SUGAR HILL

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

Avery, H., N.D.
Hebert, J., La.
Barry, E., Pa.
Jarman, E., Oklahoma
Bennett, M., Mich.
Karlin, E., Mich.
Boyce, J., Ohio
Burton, Utah
King, Calif.
Clark, L., Montana
Lesinski, Ill.
Davis, Ga.
Lestniski
Derwinski, Ill.
Lloyd, Tex.
Henry, N.Y.
Miller, N.Y.
Nedzi
Norblad
Pfeifer
Purcell
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain

The SPEAKER, On the rollocall, 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules on Monday may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the Record after the debate on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. In the request to the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. SPEAKER. The House is about to vote on the first comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation in the history of our Government. House Resolution 789, reported Tuesday by the Rules Committee, presents in general the civil rights bill passed by the House several months ago. The other body made a few necessary major changes in the voting rights, public accommodations, educational, and employment sections of the House bill. These few important changes have been constructive and will greatly aid toward the practical success and enforcement of this legislation.

Chairman Celler, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman McCulloch, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, will present to the Members a concise and factual explanation of the Senate changes from the bill passed by the House in February.

Civil rights has been debated in the Congress, pro and con, for weeks, months and for years. Had the “skim milk” civil rights bill enacted in 1957 dealt with this problem as comprehensively, factually and completely as the bill now under consideration, we would have been saved from a lot of embarrassing situations like Little Rock, Birmingham, Jacksonville, and so forth. This bill will be effective and amply provides to make all four of our Constitution a reality to all American citizens.

Presidents and American statesmen for generations knew in their own minds that civil rights legislation for all citizens had to be enacted some day. When this bill is signed into law it will be our first official start to in extending voting equality, educational equality, public facilities equality and citizenship equality to all American citizens. The civil rights bill voted on yesterday was neglected and postponed by lack of courage on the part of generations of American statesmen and leaders. Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now President Johnson have pressed the Congress for action on effective civil rights legislation for a period covering almost 30 years.

Educational advancement of our people with the help of universities, newspapers, movies, radio and television have aroused millions of our citizens to the fact that large sections of our population can no longer be denied all the citizenship privileges which our Constitution has promised. And almost two years ago.

Enactment of this legislation will not bring on an immediate civic utopia for everyone tomorrow, next month or next year. It will give our Nation a start with the necessary law to eventually eliminate second-class citizens in America. Several months ago this legislation body voted 290 to 130 on practically the identical legislation that we are considering this afternoon. Possibly some criticism will be expressed here today concerning the action of the Rules Committee in so diligently and without unnecessary delay in reporting out the resolution last Tuesday. Our only task tomorrow may be the task of Chairman Celler, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], and other members of the Judiciary Committee explain the changes made by the other body to the House as the Resolution was taken from when we convened at 10:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. when the committee by a majority vote agreed to go into executive session and vote on the resolution. Our hearings lasted, with the exception of a couple of interruptions by two quorum calls, 6½ hours.

The records show that this legislation was considered and debated by the House Judiciary Committee, 22 days; by the House Rules Committee, 7 days; on the floor of the House several months ago, 6 days, and by the Senate or other body, 83 days.

This bill has been considered by both bodies a total of approximately 114 days. If unnecessary laws, such as filibusters and amending motions were eliminated, this bill could have been disposed of in one-tenth of the time and also have given every Member of both bodies ample opportunity to express their views.

The comment has been made that a precedent was broken when the Rules Committee voted that a committee member in favor of Resolution 789 file the report and present the resolution to the House.
I want it to be understood that the members of the Rules Committee in my judgment were displaying no disregard or lack of confidence in the integrity of our colleagues for the majority of the House members decided that it was time to call a termination to some of the shenanigans and delays to which the progress of this legislation has been a victim.

I firmly believe that our good chairman, by reason of his known and admitted intense opposition to this legislation, could not enthusiastically file the report that this resolution be considered. Possibly he could have accomplished this task, but not with jubilation or enthusiasm and with any hop-skip-and-jump hilarity.

In conclusion, let me say that President Johnson last week gave this important message on civil rights:

We are going on from this civil rights bill to our children, the children of every race and color, the equal rights which the Constitution commands and justice directs. This bill will be so fashioned by the legislature as to instantly destroy the differences shaped over centuries. And there is a law more hallowed than the civil rights bill, or even the Constitution, of the United States. That law commands every man to respect the life and dignity of his neighbor—to treat others as he would be treated. That law asks not only for our obedience in our action, but understanding in our heart. May God grant us that understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who is in charge of this rule, has explained that this rule or resolution which gives only 1 hour of general debate, will be extended one-half or 15 minutes of my time to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and he can advise me as to how he wishes it allotted.

It is my opinion that the passage of this bill does not terminate the responsibility of the Congress from contributing some time, experience, and advice in the successful administering of this complex problem. Experience over the years in legislation, can well advise leaders of organizations and groups who have been active in the civil rights movement on practical methods to be followed in insuring the success of this legislation.

The support of the American public opinion is necessary for the success of civil rights legislation. Progress in the first measurement of the effectiveness of this legislation will determine its effectiveness. It is my earnest hope that some Members long experienced in legislative processes over the years will devote their time to meeting with and extending advice and counsel to the leaders of well-meaning civil rights organizations and groups who have been active in the civil rights activities in every part of the country.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under the exercise of raw, brutal power of the majority of both the Democrats and Republicans, the opponents of the civil rights bill on this side are given only 15 minutes to debate a bill that has never been before the Judiciary Committee of the House or before the House itself before today. This is not the bill that the House approved in the Senate with 80-odd new and different provisions. Under the rule, there is no opportunity for the House to consider or amend the Senate bill. When the roll is called, you will find that the House is constituted of the law of the land. It will contain implications of oppression upon the people of the United States, of brutality and raw dictatorship never before witnessed since the tragic days of reconstruction following the War Between the States.

I deeply regret that out of the 15 minutes allotted to me I cannot assign time for protests to the many patriotic Members of this House who would like to express their distaste, dismay, and disgust at this invasion of the rights of American citizens.

The history of this legislation is one of heedless trampling upon the rights of American citizens from the time the first bill was introduced, marching ruthlessly through the Judiciary Committee with every opportunity denied to Members to either discuss the measure or offer amendments. You will recall that the only committee hearings held upon the bill upon which the House voted were those which I insisted upon, in the Rules Committee over strenuous opposition, at which hearing only Members of the Congress were permitted to be heard.

In the other body, the U.S. Senate, after months of what should have been illuminating debate, a handful of Members in that body devised a new bill differing in 80-odd particulars from the House bill, and under a cloture rule each Member was given less than 1 minute for each of the many far-reaching changes in the House legislation.

It comes to the House under a rule forced through by the leadership that Mr. MADDEN, with the backing of the executive department, to begin a series of demonstrations inevitably to be accompanied by mob violence, strife, bitterness, and bloodshed. Already the second invasion of carpetbaggers from the Southland has begun, by other horde of Federal marshals, Federal agents, and agitators from the North, with the admitted aid of the Communists, are streaming into the Southland on mischief bent, backed and defended by other hordes of Federal marshals, Federal agents, and Federal power.
Be forewarned that the paid agents and leaders of the NAACP can never permit this law to be gradually and peacefully accepted because that means an end to their well-paid activities. Let us still hope for a peaceful and gradual solution to the problem that has brought this country, north, east, west, and south, closer to disaster than anything that has confronted us in the past 100 years. With all allowable disrespect to the Supreme Court of the United States, I still be permitted in this hall to utter the pious and prayerful words, "God save the United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following newspaper articles:

"King Plans Secure New Rights Law Compliance"
(By George Lardner, Jr.)

St. Augustine, Fla., July 1—The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., spelled out his summertime program today for bringing the civil rights bill home to the South.

The head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference said today that the fight throughout the South will be asked to negotiate with leaders in their communities to secure compliance with the bill's provisions against discrimination in public accommodations.

Tests will follow. Businessmen will be notified that unless they comply with the law, they will have to drop in to eat or to request a room, Dr. King explained. "Court suits will be filed against those who refuse to comply," he said.

For communities that resist the law with a united front, he predicted "massive direct action."

He singled out six southern cities already scheduled for direct action: Birmingham, Montgomery, Selma, Tuscaloosa, and Gadsden, all in Alabama, and Albany, Ga. "Their laws, which have already said they won't comply," he said.

Attempts will also be made to turn Savannah, Ga., into a "model community."

He labeled the two phases of the program "Operation Dialog" and "Operation Implementation."

In St. Augustine, he said, the "dialog" has already begun. He said he was encouraged by appointment of a secret, four-member biracial committee to reduce racial tensions.

Civil rights demonstrations have been temporarily called off here to give the committee a chance to work.

The Negro civil rights leader said he understood President Johnson had "personally intervened with Gov. Farris Bryant in the St. Augustine crisis."

Meanwhile, members of St. Augustine's Motor Court & Restaurant Association met jointly to pledge to obey the civil rights bill once it becomes law, "regardless of our personal feelings."

About 50 businessmen and women took part in the vote. Five opposed the pledge of obedience.

"We want all Americans to know we are unanimously opposed to the bill," said motel owner James Brock, spokesman for the group. "But the only thing we can do in public accommodation is obey the law."

POINT OF VIEW: Civil Rights in History

President Johnson vetoed the civil rights bill. In his veto message to Congress, he spoke of the challenges of race safeguards which go infinitely beyond any that the General Government has ever provided for the white race. In fact, the distinction of race and color is, by the bill, made to operate in favor of the colored and against the white race. They interfere with the municipal regulations of the States, with the relations existing exclusively between a State and its citizens, and between inhabitants of the same State—an absorption and assumption of power by the General Government which, if acquiesced in, must sap and destroy our federative system of limited powers, and break down the barriers which preserve the rights of the States. Further steps, on the other hand, rather strife, to centralization and the concentration of all legislative power in the National Government.

Do the men like Lyndon Johnson? Well, no. This commentator is quoting, of course, the words of President Andrew Johnson, in vetoing the first civil rights bill of 1866. But they seem apropos.

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, this day will long be remembered by the American people. Their memory of it will be bright and clear. July 2, 1964, will be marked as the day on which greater violence was done to the U.S. Constitution than had ever been witnessed by Americans.

We stand today before a Civil Rights Act of the race issue and get down to the heart of it. When that heart is reached we find that it is about 10 percent civil rights legislation and 90 percent extension of the concept of further centralization of powers to the Federal Government. This extended Central Government will, after the enactment of the bill, prove to be a curse to our people and a destructive assault upon the basic tenets which have made our system of government great.

Nothing in the legislation commends itself to me. The tactics employed in the House of Representatives and in the House Judiciary Committee in pressing this bad legislation upon the people are reprehensible. The sharp, bitter language of proponents of the legislation has been equaled only by their unwillingness to heed meritorious contentions made by thoughtful citizens on both sides of the question. My colleagues in legislative procedures will rise to haunt some of those who have so happily employed them to accomplish what they consider to be a great legislative victory.

The American people are entitled to a better deal than they are getting today. We should give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I close these brief remarks by invoking the sage counsel given to the Nation by President Woodrow Wilson, when he said:

"Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the communities of which our complex body politic is made up."

Paternal morality enforced by the judge is not the morality of a free man. In the past, Washington do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and local sense of individual value and convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control.

You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. * * * It is the alchemy of decay.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, even in Mississippi necessitated my inserting in the Congressional Record on yesterday an indictment of the past and present official leadership in the State of Mississippi. In that statement, I categorically accused the entire corps of public officials of that State of being responsible for the violent oppression of the masses of Mississippians, both white and Negro. That oppression, as I stated, has been and still is complete in regard to economic, social, and political conditions of the vast majority of the people of the State.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to document further those charges and to insist again that Federal protection is a minimal necessity, and that a state of terror is to be brought to a halt. On April 4, 1963, I called upon all of my colleagues in the Congress "to join me in protesting and denouncing the illegal activities on the part of the authorities of Mississippi" and I stated then that "these crimes cry out for positive and courageous action, not tomorrow, but now."

Mr. Speaker, what I said then is even more current now. And, to remind all the members of Congress of the gravity of the situation—of the inhumanity of man to man in Mississippi—of the gross and brutal injustices being visited upon Americans there—of the complete breakdown of law and order within official ranks among the State's public officials—I ask permission to insert in the Congressional Record this article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the issue for June 30, 1964, by M. W. Newman, which appeared in the New York Times a year ago and further documents my indictment of yesterday.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 30, 1964]

MISSISSIPPI: LAND OF VIOLENCE—BLOODY PAGE IN SOUTH'S HISTORY

(By M. W. Newman)

On September 25, 1961, a Negro named Herbert Lee was shot to death in downtown Leland, twenty-five Mississippi towns. He had been active in trying to register Negro voters in the South's bastion State of white supremacy.

His killer was State Representative E. H. Hurst. The authorities held that Hurst had shot in justifiable self-defense. A Negro logger, Louis Allen, was one of the alibi witnesses. Allen was convicted in the Leland murder and is on death row today.

On January 31 of this year, Allen was killed by shotgun blasts in that same town. Student civil rights workers say he admitted before his death that he lied to protect Hurst at the court's inquest under threat of death.

Muder—unsolved murder—has run like chain lightning around Mississippi as the voter-registration drive has threatened the centuries-old rule of Jim Crow.
Acts of terrorism against Negroes and their young white allies are everyday occurrences. U.S. Justice Department investigators believe that 9,000 jobs have been lost by Negroes throughout the South in the last 6 months. Negroes say the figure may be far higher.

Some Negroes have been hounded out of their jobs and homes. Negroes have been driven out of jobs and homes. Bombings, cross burnings, threats and terrorism in southern Mississippi may be far higher. There may be guerrilla units and primed for terror. Negro organizations have been driven out of business. A load of garbage was dumped on his lawn. He was burned in 64 of the State's 82 counties. These bombings, cross burnings, threats and terrorizing of Negroes have been driven out of jobs and homes.

There may be bombings, cross burning, threats and terrorism in southern Mississippi. Negroes say the figure may be far higher. Negroes have been driven out of jobs and homes. Bombings, cross burnings, threats and terrorism in southern Mississippi may be far higher.

The last 5 years the Leflore County—Tylertown, Walthall County—John Hardy, SNCC registration worker, took two Negroes to the courthouse to register. The registrar told him he wasn't registering voters that day. When they turned to go, Hardy was accused of beating, threatening, and shooting. Negroes have been flogged. Negroes have been flogged. Negroes have been flogged.

The record of shootings, beatings, jailings, and beatings of teen-aged Emmett Till, of Mississippi has beefed up both its state highway patrol and police forces in individual towns. New laws permit crackdowns on picketing, mass demonstrations, and "disturbances of the peace." All these incidents.

The Supreme Court has, by its decisions, torn asunder the Constitution of the United States. The President of the United States, the Congress, in making his address recent in the White House with the Negroes and whites can get along together in this Nation. They want to. The vast majority of our citizens of whatever color feel this way. They resent the violence, the bloodshed, the hatreds and the distortions that are the trademark of extremist groups of both races. What then is the difficulty?

In the teeth of the press, of the Congress, of the Federal government once again. Perhaps all this is too much to hope for, but it is certainly something worth fighting for.

One hundred ninety million Americans, in living their private lives, have certain inalienable private rights under our Constitution. The right of private ownership is a right both personal and real, the right to select customers in private business, the right to choose whom to patronize in private business and whom not to patronize. The right of personal choice in respect to whom to marry, whom to hire, whom to fire. To be able to buy and sell, to remain in the Constitution of the United States, even if the Supreme Court of the United States does not do so. Then perhaps at long last we can start this Nation on the road to real independence. The United States, if we are to have a real independence.

A vote for this bill, with its self-serving title of "conservation of resources" is nothing less than an act to surrender the constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom in their private lives. It is abject abdication of congressional responsibility to preserve and protect the Constitution and the position of Federal-State balance in the face of political pressures such as Congress has never faced before: and knowing that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by its decisions, torn the Constitution out of all rational historical proportion in disregard of the will of Congress and the intent of the Framers. It is outright surrender of our cherished rights as free American citizens. It is a perversion of the Constitution.

A vote for this legislation is not a vote to be proud of, for it is a vote to undermine the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps in November the voters will elect a Congress with a majority that will stand firmly for upholding the clear mandate of the voters and the President and the Constitution of the United States, even if the Supreme Court of the United States does not do so. Then perhaps at long last we can start this Nation on the road to real independence. The United States, if we are to have a real independence.

A vote for this bill, with its self-serving title of "conservation of resources" is nothing less than an act to surrender the constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom in their private lives. It is abject abdication of congressional responsibility to preserve and protect the Constitution and the position of Federal-State balance in the face of political pressures such as Congress has never faced before: and knowing that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by its decisions, torn the Constitution out of all rational historical proportion in disregard of the will of Congress and the intent of the Framers. It is outright surrender of our cherished rights as free American citizens. It is a perversion of the Constitution.

A vote for this bill, with its self-serving title of "conservation of resources" is nothing less than an act to surrender the constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom in their private lives. It is abject abdication of congressional responsibility to preserve and protect the Constitution and the position of Federal-State balance in the face of political pressures such as Congress has never faced before: and knowing that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by its decisions, torn the Constitution out of all rational historical proportion in disregard of the will of Congress and the intent of the Framers. It is outright surrender of our cherished rights as free American citizens. It is a perversion of the Constitution.

A vote for this bill, with its self-serving title of "conservation of resources" is nothing less than an act to surrender the constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom in their private lives. It is abject abdication of congressional responsibility to preserve and protect the Constitution and the position of Federal-State balance in the face of political pressures such as Congress has never faced before: and knowing that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by its decisions, torn the Constitution out of all rational historical proportion in disregard of the will of Congress and the intent of the Framers. It is outright surrender of our cherished rights as free American citizens. It is a perversion of the Constitution.
ton Attorney General who, on his record and for political advantage, has shown again and again that he just cannot wait to help destroy these rights.

Stripped of its political hypocrisy, this bill is a naked grasp for extreme Federal power over private business and private lives. Do what you will with public accommodations and equal employment opportunity, there is not a single word in the Constitution to support such Federal control. This legislation—In the name of civil rights, takes much civil rights away from all Americans than it confers on any minority group.

When the States wrote the Constitution, they were very careful to create a Federal Government of limited powers. The Infringement of this bill on the police powers of the States is exactly what the 10th amendment to the Constitution was designed to prevent.

If we had a Supreme Court worthy of the name, there would be little to fear from this bill because its unconstitutional aspects would soon be struck down by the Court. Of this we could be confident. Unfortunately, it is otherwise, and has been widely and ever since the incumbency of the present Chief Justice.

It is truly a tragedy that so many of our people have lost faith in the U.S. Supreme Court. This loss of public respect is infecting our entire judicial structure. Decision after decision of the High Court has been on the basis of personal predilection and social attitude of a plurality of members instead of on a basis of law and precedent. Confusion has reached a point where even the most learned members of the bar in America are unable to advise their clients the course of the law or the prospect of decisions on issues affecting individual rights or Federal-State relations.

A majority of the U.S. Supreme Court as presently constituted will hold that digging a worm in your own backyard is interstate commerce should it be necessary to do so to uphold this bill. In reality, such business is of the intrastate variety. The same type of illustration of the practical effect of this bill can be carried right down the line into hiring and firing policies, seniority lists in unions, and a thousand and one nooks and crannies of our private lives that this bill imposes.

The same type of illustrations of the practical effect of this bill can be carried right down the line into hiring and firing policies, seniority lists in unions, and a thousand and one nooks and crannies of our private lives that this bill imposes. This legislation goes much further than merely making it unlawful to hire anyone under 16 years of age. Obviously, it requires a constitutional amendment, in the manner that this bill provides. As purport to be established in this bill's titles II and VII, the provisions of this bill are sheer Federal decree without constitutional basis.

If a businessman in Arkansas or in any other State does not want to hire, in his private business, a member of a particular race or religion, this is his undeniable constitutional right as a free American. It is his business, not the Federal Government's. Those who would legislate otherwise here today would literally surrender the constitutionally protected rights most cherished by all Americans to a Federal Caesar who plays the Pied Piper to the Congress of the United States from Maine to California. I want no part of a surrender of our rights to such political pressure.

What should be done with this legislation? The most offensive Titles are II and VII, Public Accommodations and Equal Employment Opportunity. How can they be amended to assure a reasonable amount of protection to all Americans without disregard for the plain language of the 10th amendment which provides that the powers not granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution are reserved to the States and to the people.

The Public Accommodations Title (title II) should be stricken from this legislation in its entirety and a simple provision substituted requiring that the sale of food, shelter, drugs, medicines, or other necessities of life by the Federal Government, or by persons or corporations engaged in interstate commerce, shall be without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or religion. Title II of the present bill, seeking to define inns, hotels, motels, soda fountains, theaters, and the like as subject to Federal regulation because their operations “affect commerce,” is a palpable deception, for on no rational basis can it be said that the mere serving of food or the showing of a movie is interstate commerce. The fact that the customers of a business move from State to State cannot constitute the business engaged in interstate commerce. Undeniable, such business in an obvious way functions “affects commerce.” But if the phrase “affecting commerce” is to be a legal basis for the establishment of complete Federal police power over such activities, we shall indeed have established Federal power for virtually everything anyone does in his daily living “affects commerce,” one way or another. “Affecting commerce” is not interstate commerce.

A simple amendment such as I have indicated above would prohibit discrimination in interstate commerce at restaurants located in transportation terminals, on railroad trains, on airlines and bus lines, and in the myriad of other locations that are honest-to-goodness interstate commerce. This is as far as we may constitutionally legislate at the Federal level in the application of Federal police power to activities within the States.
The regulation of hotels, motels, and the like within the several States is for the States, not for the Federal Government under the Constitution. Let us face this fact squarely and honestly. Let us do it, so that no man may hide behind the Congress despite the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is inconceivable at this stage of debate, after the fullest and most complete exchange of views and information concerning this bill, that any Member is not aware of the perversion of the legislative function to steamroller an unconstitutional law onto the books at the expense of the reserved constitutional rights of all Americans.

Title VII, Equal Employment Opportunity, should be amended to apply only to the operations of the Federal Government and to persons or companies doing business for or with the Federal Government. To undertake by Federal law to police private business and private labor under the Constitution is a perversion of the legislative function.

The present administration has deliberated with the Negro leaders for good civil rights legislation. It is not for the Federal Government to police private business not engaged in interstate commerce nor doing business in interstate commerce or doing business with or subsidized by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is in this country a sentiment in history a shameful need for good civil rights legislation. It is shameful because civil rights should come from the hearts of men and not from the printed page, the bill, or the speech of the legislator. It takes human beings to form in which it is presented to us today, a serious mistake. If enacted into law and undertaken to be enforced throughout the land, this bill will set brother against brother and bad us and States against the Federal Government.

This is precisely what those seeking to further aggravate our domestic troubles wish to accomplish in America. It is exactly what the rabble-rousers, the left-wingers, the fellow travelers and the Communists want us to do. It is the sort of legislation which will do more harm to our country if enacted than were there to be no legislation whatsoever.

Leaders in the Negro movement have made it clear that whether this bill passes or not their demonstrations will continue. In the light of such statements, one can only speculate as to what may lie ahead for our Nation.

One thing, however, is beyond dispute. The Senate has not been adequately chosen to make this serious domestic problem a political issue. It encourages the setting of the national stage for violence while seeking to convey the false impression to colored people that it alone is their champion and those who oppose this particular unconstitutional bill would deny them the proper rights of Negroes everywhere. If proof be needed of the truth of this, it is readily found in the actions of no less than a member of the President's Cabinet. The Attorney General of the United States, while seeking to employ extraordinary and plenary powers, caused to be set up in his office before dealing with the University of Alabama crisis, a complete television installation so that throughout the clash between State authorities in that unhappy affair, he and his deputy were "on camera." This was a deliberately staged performance for use as political propaganda without regard for the strength of the Union.

This Nation of 190 million people has approximately 170 million white and 20 million colored citizens. This civil rights bill steals private rights away from all 190 million Americans—rights of the most valuable type. These are the most valuable type. These are the rights of association, of property, of privacy— even the right of personal choice—all to be prohibited by politically motivated, power-hungry bureaucrats from faraway Washington.

When the full impact of this grievously unconstitutional and unwarranted invasion of all Americans' private rights is upon our people, I believe their support of those who stand firm and vote against this legislation will be in percentages even greater than 10 to 1.

I am proud that I am recorded, by my vote against this unconstitutional law, as working to protect the people of this country against a law that would create a Federal Frankenstein masquerading as civil rights.

I believe that the American people will remember who stood fast for their rights when the time comes. I believe it is certain—it will not be those who vote for this unconstitutional surrender to a Federal police state.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, two facts need to be understood.

First, the House has no parliamentary opportunity to amend the Senate bill. Neither can the amendments adopted by the Senate be acted upon individually. Under the rule, all of the Senate amendments must be voted up or down as a package, and if they are voted up, the bill as passed by the Senate goes straight to the President for his signature. This bill should not have been before the Senate in the first place.

Second, in the time allotted by the rule for House deliberation, there is less than 9 seconds for each of the 435 Members. It is difficult to find, count and read the 87 changes made in a House bill which House civil rights leaders said could not and should not be amended at all, and none of these amendments have ever been afforded a committee hearing by either body of Congress.

Some of these 87 amendments may be bad, some may make this bill better. The net effect is good or bad, no two people can agree. Without attempting to make a complete inventory, here are some of the changes made by the Senate which I regard as bad:

First. In the House bill, the Attorney General was given no specific right to intervene in lawsuits brought by individuals under title II—public accommodations—and title VII—FEPC. Under the Senate amendment he is empowered to do so.

Second. In the House bill, the Attorney General was not specifically authorized to institute suit in the name of the United States on behalf of an individual under the FEPC title, but he is granted that authority under the Senate amendment.

Third. In the public accommodations title of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered to agree to conciliation through local agencies before bringing a suit against the business—man and under the FEPC title, the Commission was required to do the same. Under the Senate amendment, the Attorney General can bring suit under both titles immediately. All he has to do is to allege that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists and the court will grant a temporary injunction which may later be made permanent if the Attorney General later produces evidence of a pattern or practice.

Fourth. In addition to originating suits or intervening in an individual's suit under the public accommodations and FEPC titles, the Attorney General may, under the Senate bill, ask the court to appoint private counsel for the complainant and waive any costs assessable against the complainant.

Fifth. Under the FEPC title of the House bill, all covered employers were required to keep records concerning job applications, hiring, firing, promotions, working conditions, pay policies, and so forth which would have to be furnished to the Commission. Under the Senate amendment, employers in States which have State FEPC laws are to all intents and purposes exempt from Federal record keeping.

Sixth. Under the FEPC title of the House bill, an employer was permitted to refuse to hire an atheist. The Senate deleted this clause.

The House bill placed a limitation of $2.5 million the first year and $10 million the second year on appropriations for the FEPC title. The Senate struck out the limitation and left an open end authorization.

Eighth. Under title X, the House bill limited the number of regular employees for the new Community Relations Service to six. The Senate deleted the limitation.

Title X of the House bill permitted the new agency to utilize the services of public agencies at State and local levels. The Senate bill extends this permission to private organizations as well.
Tenth. The three-judge court provision was confined to title I—voting—where the bill was held to be discriminatory. The Senate bill contains a provision which is even more discriminatory than the voting provision. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there is not a single substantive amendment of importance in this bill that is not discriminatory. The bill as it stands today, when combining the voting provision with the other provisions of the bill, is a bill of this nature and magnitude and having this effect on the life of each and every one of us should properly go to conference rather than be considered for enactment here. It is, of course, with no right to make changes in a situation where there are some 90 amendments to the bill.

If each Member of this body, with the time limit of 1 hour on this resolution, were given an equal opportunity to discuss the matter, each would have 9 seconds on it. If each Member were given an equal opportunity to discuss each of the 90 amendments, the House would need tenths of a second to discuss each amendment. I say that this is a farce upon the proper and orderly legislative process particularly in consideration of a bill of this significance.

Why do I say that as it relates to what the other body did? I say that this bill is stronger than the bill that passed the House. I say that it is true in many respects where the Senate amendment is a complete departure from the provisions aimed at protecting citizens from discrimination on account of race," et cetera. For some obscure reason, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals seeking relief from the discrimination complained of. The Senate bill eliminates this provision. In some obscure sense, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titled II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals seeking relief from the discrimination complained of. The Senate bill eliminates this provision. In some obscure sense, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that nothing said in this brief interim by proponents or opponents will change a single vote. The roll could with the same result have been called as well before the debate as after. It is regrettable that this is so, because it is regrettable that it is so simple as some have pretended. It involves more than a question of justice or injustice, and votes on the rollcall cannot and by fairminded men will not be determined purely on the basis of uniformity and discipline. I do not acknowledge equality under law as the soul of morality will with perfect consistency reject as immorality statutory infidelity to the supreme law of the land. And this bill, in several parts, is clearly unfaithful to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to spend this time discussing the principal subject matter before us, and that is should this rule accepting the Senate amendments and adopting the bill as amended be put to a vote?

That is the issue before the House now. There were some 90 changes made in the other body, many of which were very substantial in nature. Certainly, there was no bill before the House since I have been here, for 10 years, coming out of the Committee on the Judiciary, that has more effect on the basic constitutional property, business and personal rights of the individual in America than this one before us here today, which delegates to the Federal Government to a broader or greater extent new powers. Certainly, a bill of this nature and magnitude and having this effect on the life of each and every one of us should properly go to conference rather than be considered for enactment here. It is, of course, with no right to make changes in a situation where there are some 90 amendments to the bill.

If each Member of this body, with the time limit of 1 hour on this resolution, were given an equal opportunity to discuss the matter, each would have 9 seconds on it. If each Member were given an equal opportunity to discuss each of the 90 amendments, the House would need tenths of a second to discuss each amendment. I say that this is a farce upon the proper and orderly legislative process particularly in consideration of a bill of this significance.

Why do I say that as it relates to what the other body did? I say that this bill is stronger than the bill that passed the House. I say that it is true in many respects where the Senate amendment is a complete departure from the provisions aimed at protecting citizens from discrimination on account of race," et cetera. For some obscure reason, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals seeking relief from the discrimination complained of. The Senate bill eliminates this provision. In some obscure sense, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that nothing said in this brief interim by proponents or opponents will change a single vote. The roll could with the same result have been called as well before the debate as after. It is regrettable that this is so, because it is regrettable that it is so simple as some have pretended. It involves more than a question of justice or injustice, and votes on the rollcall cannot and by fairminded men will not be determined purely on the basis of uniformity and discipline. I do not acknowledge equality under law as the soul of morality will with perfect consistency reject as immorality statutory infidelity to the supreme law of the land. And this bill, in several parts, is clearly unfaithful to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to spend this time discussing the principal subject matter before us, and that is should this rule accepting the Senate amendments and adopting the bill as amended be put to a vote?

That is the issue before the House now. There were some 90 changes made in the other body, many of which were very substantial in nature. Certainly, there was no bill before the House since I have been here, for 10 years, coming out of the Committee on the Judiciary, that has more effect on the basic constitutional property, business and personal rights of the individual in America than this one before us here today, which delegates to the Federal Government to a broader or greater extent new powers. Certainly, a bill of this nature and magnitude and having this effect on the life of each and every one of us should properly go to conference rather than be considered for enactment here. It is, of course, with no right to make changes in a situation where there are some 90 amendments to the bill.

If each Member of this body, with the time limit of 1 hour on this resolution, were given an equal opportunity to discuss the matter, each would have 9 seconds on it. If each Member were given an equal opportunity to discuss each of the 90 amendments, the House would need tenths of a second to discuss each amendment. I say that this is a farce upon the proper and orderly legislative process particularly in consideration of a bill of this significance.

Why do I say that as it relates to what the other body did? I say that this bill is stronger than the bill that passed the House. I say that it is true in many respects where the Senate amendment is a complete departure from the provisions aimed at protecting citizens from discrimination on account of race," et cetera. For some obscure reason, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals seeking relief from the discrimination complained of. The Senate bill eliminates this provision. In some obscure sense, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that nothing said in this brief interim by proponents or opponents will change a single vote. The roll could with the same result have been called as well before the debate as after. It is regrettable that this is so, because it is regrettable that it is so simple as some have pretended. It involves more than a question of justice or injustice, and votes on the rollcall cannot and by fairminded men will not be determined purely on the basis of uniformity and discipline. I do not acknowledge equality under law as the soul of morality will with perfect consistency reject as immorality statutory infidelity to the supreme law of the land. And this bill, in several parts, is clearly unfaithful to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.
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Why do I say that as it relates to what the other body did? I say that this bill is stronger than the bill that passed the House. I say that it is true in many respects where the Senate amendment is a complete departure from the provisions aimed at protecting citizens from discrimination on account of race," et cetera. For some obscure reason, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals seeking relief from the discrimination complained of. The Senate bill eliminates this provision. In some obscure sense, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the House debate—were it bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.
These examples I believe amply demonstrate, first, that this amended bill is stronger in many instances than the House bill and second, that the broad effect of many of them necessitates adequate and comprehensive consideration by the Committee. I believe accomplished in this instance by voting down the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments that were attached to the House bill that was passed in February of this year are clearly acceptable by the majority of the House and the Judiciary Committee. No one will agree with all of them. I have some disagreements with some of them, but those are not overriding disagreements.

In title VII, for example, "Job Opportunities": My own opinion is that too much has been loaded onto the courts and yet at the same time the Jury Commission and all the other agencies which operate in the public arena.

The bill provides the framework under which grievances can be aired at the conference table and in the courts rather than keeping them in the departments. The bill will lessen tensions, not increase tensions.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does at this historic time and moment is to deliver on the promise that was made by the Constitution, and most especially those mighty amendments to the Constitution which were passed after the War Between the States.

We emphasize further that the purpose of this bill is to safeguard individuals against denials of their constitutionally guaranteed rights. It insures that persons will be free of racial and religious discrimination in their relations with public institutions or private institutions which operate in the public arena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALGER). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this additional time to call the attention of the House to the Judiciary Committee and we were allowed to cooperate fully in securing and maintaining its acceptance on the floor of the House.

When the bill reached the Senate, there were again loud cries that the title would have to be eliminated if the bill were to be accepted. Again, it was the only way through the courage and insistence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and others that the title, even though slightly modified, was retained as an integral part of this final bill which we are shortly to vote upon.

I want to pay my tribute to Judge McCULLOCH for his integrity and to all of my colleagues on the Subcommittee, Messrs. DENT, PUCINSKI, DANIELS, HAWKINS, GIBBONS, GOODBELL, MARTIN, and McCULLOCH, and to the membership of this House for what I think, in the long run of history, will turn out to be the section which does more to eventually win the hearts and minds of all Americans for the broad principle of equality of citizenship that is inherent in this civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, no legislation can accomplish miracles, but we have set a goal through which the people of America may march forward to a better day for all of its citizens, and into a bright light where they may face their fellow men and women throughout the world with a clear conscience that we recognize at last that in all aspects of life, every human being is an equal creature of his God.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, at this historic moment, and in order that the record may not be forgotten, it is in keeping with my colleagues the fact that title VII of this memorable legislation would not be in the bill except for the foresight, the persistence, and the courage, in the face of much pressure, of a few individuals.

Equal opportunity in employment has been in order through which the people of America may march forward to a better day for all of its citizens, and into a bright light where they may face their fellow men and women throughout the world with a clear conscience that we recognize at last that in all aspects of life, every human being is an equal creature of his God.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from New York on his remarks and join with him in strong support of a bill which is the civil rights bill wherein the Congress will be keeping covenant with the American dream; making possible a new birth of freedom and guaranteeing that rights inherent to all are a reality for all.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my friend, the gentleman from New York on his excellent remarks. I point out to the members of the House that this civil rights bill is a matter of principle of equality of citizenship that is inherent in this civil rights bill.

There are excellent basic provisions in this civil rights bill which will give the basis for real McCreary's civil rights and equal opportunity for all of our people, without discrimination or segregation because of race, color, or religion. Success of this civil rights legislation must depend on people of good
Mr. Speaker, this is truly a great and historic day. But it represents a mere beginning of the struggle ahead of us. As God has helped those who believe deeply in the idea of human dignity, we must strive unceasingly to make this law meaningful and to bring to it the spirit of tolerance and understanding. Single to the pillar of the great society and the model for democratic societies everywhere that it is intended to be. Let us in the spirit of the Great Emancipator go forth "with malice toward none, but with charity for all the Nation's wounds" to continue our Nation's march toward the noble goals and ideals of true freedom.

To the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from New York and all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the dedication and achievement of the many good individuals, I compliment the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, today we have taken a long-awaited step toward fulfilling our obligations to our heritage and to our fellow Americans. A fundamental pledge of the Declaration of Independence is that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is a pledge guaranteed by our Constitution; it is a pledge which Americans have fought and died to defend; and it is a pledge which, until today, has been unkept.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that all individuals have not been equally able, in wealth, or in education, or in talent. Unfortunately, it is also true that all individuals have not been recognized as equal before the law. And we as Americans can hardly deny that it ought to be possible in this great land of ours, where liberty, freedom, and justice are cherished rights, for all Americans to have equal opportunities to develop their resources and talents to the fullest degree, free from restraint based upon the color of their skin.

The great significance of the passage of this legislation today is that it provides a strong legal foundation for the protection of these rights. While such legal protection in no way removes from each individual in this Nation the obligation to insure equal rights and opportunities to all, it is a step toward closing the gap which continues to exist between dreams and reality. We, the representatives of this Nation, elected to represent the people, and supported by the executive and judicial branches of the Government, have provided in this Civil Rights Act, a foundation upon which this Nation may build constructively and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly a great and historic day. But it represents a mere beginning of the struggle ahead of us. As God has helped those who believe deeply in the idea of human dignity, we must strive unceasingly to make this law meaningful and to bring to it the spirit of tolerance and understanding. Single to the pillar of the great society and the model for democratic societies everywhere that it is intended to be. Let us in the spirit of the Great Emancipator go forth "with malice toward none, but with charity for all the Nation’s wounds" to continue our Nation’s march toward the noble goals and ideals of true freedom.

To the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] and members of the distinguished Judiciary Committee who make this great piece of legislation possible, I wish to express my deep appreciation and thanks for this outstanding achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I would humbly ask to associate myself with the remarks just made by the gentleman from New York and all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the dedication and achievement of the many good individuals, I compliment the gentleman from New York.
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Mr. Speaker, it is true that all individuals have not been equally able, in wealth, or in education, or in talent. Unfortunately, it is also true that all individuals have not been recognized as equal before the law. And we as Americans can hardly deny that it ought to be possible in this great land of ours, where liberty, freedom, and justice are cherished rights, for all Americans to have equal opportunities to develop their resources and talents to the fullest degree, free from restraint based upon the color of their skin.

The great significance of the passage of this legislation today is that it provides a strong legal foundation for the protection of these rights. While such legal protection in no way removes from each individual in this Nation the obligation to insure equal rights and opportunities to all, it is a step toward closing the gap which continues to exist between dreams and reality. We, the representatives of this Nation, elected to represent the people, and supported by the executive and judicial branches of the Government, have provided in this Civil Rights Act, a foundation upon which this Nation may build constructively and effectively.
move. Any provision was acceptable so long as was done in the name of civil rights. Any bill could be passed so long as it possessed the right label—civil rights. H.R. 7152 had this label so it passed the House.

I say this country has come to a bad state when the constitutional rights of all its citizens are being trampled by such legislation as H.R. 7152 just because some people believe it is "morally" right to do so.

I have some predictions to make on some of the end results of this so-called civil rights legislation. Some Members of this body who have been victimized by this "snow" job will involuntarily depart this scene when their constituents come to realize that their constitutional rights have been given away to placate certain minority groups. I predict that when the citizens of this country, in the North, South, East, and West, are awakened to the far-reaching effects of legislation which would make the police-state approach, to the problems which could well be noted in Washington, New York, St. Louis, and Boston, they will not afford to. Their stock in trade is going to be in serious trouble as it possesses the right label—civil rights.

I have some predictions to make on some of the end results of this so-called civil rights legislation. Some Members of this body who have been victimized by this "snow" job will involuntarily depart this scene when their constituents come to realize that their constitutional rights have been given away to placate certain minority groups. I predict that when the citizens of this country, in the North, South, East, and West, are awakened to the far-reaching effects of legislation which would make the police-state approach, to the problems which could well be noted in Washington, New York, St. Louis, and Boston, they will not afford to. Their stock in trade is going to be in serious trouble as it possesses the right label—civil rights.
tution. The constitutional amendment which I have suggested reads as follows:

Freedom of association shall be preserved. The Federal Government shall not compel association of persons in private businesses or professional associations, or personal organizations, but may assist in programs to provide equal accommodations and facilities for all, including associations for the equal benefit of all races and colors. The State or any political subdivisions thereof shall provide equal accommodations and facilities when equal facilities are not in fact provided.

Each State shall have exclusive jurisdiction over its public educational institutions and may regulate such things on the basis of sex or race when this is decided by it to be in the best public interest or to assist in preserving the peace and order of the community. In individual associations, provided that equal facilities shall be maintained at all times.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this resolution—House Joint Resolution 769—I do so in the firm belief that the civil rights bill (H.R. 7152) is consistent with our Federal Constitution.

It is my fervent hope that the effect of this legislation may be to promote harmonious relations among Americans, regardless of race or color.

Respect for all Americans, regardless of race or color, must be provided in this legislation should be sufficient to put an end to mass demonstrations and racial conflict. Of course, laws alone will never end discrimination. Furthermore, if the principal benefit of this law is limited to those cases which are enforced by the courts, those who have supported it are destined to disappointment.

As in the case of all other laws, substantial voluntary compliance is necessary in order for such laws to be truly effective. This is doubly true in the case of the civil rights bill. Citizens of our Nation should recognize the scope, as well as the limitations, of this legislation. They should resolve within the provisions of this bill to make it work.

The civil rights bill of 1964 is and should be a most articulate expression of the Congress—and of the citizens of the United States in behalf of fairness and respect for all Americans, regardless of race or color.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of a few minutes this House will give its final majority approval to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As one who on October 23 I said in a House speech:

If any provision which I regard as unconstitutional is incorporated in the civil rights bill, I will have no choice but to vote against the entire bill and I will so vote.

For better or worse, so far as the future verdict of the voters of Michigan's Third District is concerned, I am living up to that commitment.

These are the grounds on which I voted against the original House bill on February 10. Although improved in some particulars, I believe the Senate version, now before the House, still contains clearly and grievously unconstitutional provisions.

Accordingly, I shall vote "No" again today.

And now, for better or worse, so far as the future general welfare of the Nation and the American people is concerned, this sweeping measure becomes law. What of the days—and the problems—ahead?

First. It is the clear and inescapable duty of the President and the executive branch to implement and enforce the law—and of all citizens to obey it. I continue to reject the concept of civil disobedience.

Second. It is the function of the judicial branch to interpret the law, to adjudicate cases arising thereunder, and to pass on constitutional issues raised incident thereto. It is a corollary right of citizens to have and press such issues.

Third. As experience or public sentiment may hereafter warrant, it is right and proper to seek future changes in the law in this area by legislative enactment, amendment, or judicial interpretation. Congress has not closed up shop.

I do not expect either instant utopia or inevitable disaster in consequence of passage of this law. While stating certain clear responsibilities and obvious prerogatives of government and citizens, I venture also some hopes.

So far as the laudable objectives of the new law are concerned—and they are noted—many will receive maximum public acceptance and support, through voluntary compliance.

I hope our citizens will recognize and demonstrate that freemen can do what is right, what is just, what is decent and helpful, without waiting for the compulsory force of law.

I hope that in large measure a good will "consent of the governed" will work in the constructive end that the harsh letter of the law be not translated into the spirit of nullity and that the vast police powers created in this law will be little used because little needed.

I hope that a maximum voluntary compliance will frustrate the big-government-social-planners' dream of new and mushrooming bureaucracies and powers.

I hope that use of the new law, and of the newly created governmental powers, will be for the purpose of righting genuine wrongs and not for the purpose of creating more tension and turmoil.

I hope there will be an early and expanding moratorium on mass demonstrations and incitements to passion and violence.

I hope there will be a rediscovery of constitutional limitations and judicial self-restraint on the part of the courts—especially when the courts gain unprecedented new powers.

I hope the "victors" in this long legislative controversy will be neither arrogant nor intolerant and that the "losers" will be neither demagogues nor pharisees in adherence to the constitutional principles in which they still believe.

And, above all, I hope the plea of President Lincoln will again be heard, and this the letter heeded:

"We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the first time as a Member of this House. I do so on an occasion of great historical significance. The thread of history which runs through this House, through Congress, through the United States, through the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, through the Emancipation Proclamation of July 4, 1863, through every act of this great deliberative body which advances the cause of human dignity and freedom, binds us all together today to all of these great events.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 will take its place in history—not as an attempt to solve a regional issue but as a means of answering a national problem. This Congress has worked its will. Bipartisan efforts have produced this piece of legislation which proclaims to the world that a free society can adjust—can make amends for the wrongs of the past century. The law which this Congress has passed is a declaration of our national greatness which proudly proclaims that "all men are created equal." The passage of this civil rights bill is no panacea—nor is it a Pandora's box. It gives us a constructive framework within which to work. Only experience will indicate where we must strengthen or modify. It will call for adjustments in ways of life—but adjustments will mean the blood and sinew of a democracy.

We have this day advanced the cause of freedom and equality.

We have moved to give those who hungered and thirsted for justice a chance. We have given the rule of law an effective tool with which to cope with the problems facing our society.

We have demonstrated to the world that freedom, justice, equality, and the dignity of man are not goals of the present but goals of our future which we will secure for all of our people—goals which this Congress has achieved in part today in passing this Civil Rights Act.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today gives us a constructive framework within which to work. Only experience will indicate where we must strengthen or modify. It will call for adjustments in ways of life—but adjustments will mean the blood and sinew of a democracy.

I say this not because I am opposed to this bill—not because we are passing legislation which is, I sincerely believe, unconstitutional on its face. We have in the past passed many bills which were unconstitutional and certainly many bills have been passed by this body to which I was opposed.

But these things are not shameful. The shameful thing about our action today is that we are passing this legislation—more drastic, perhaps, and more authoritarian than any measure to come out of this Congress in a century—under the pressure of the threats of a militant minority. In other words, we are acting with a political shotgun pointed at our heads in an election year.

I do not doubt the sincerity of many of the proponents of this legislation. Nor am I opposed to the protection of the civil and human rights of all individual Americans. But I cannot believe that it is less than shameful for this House—this great heritage as an independent, courageous legislative body—to pass any legislation whatsoever, no matter how meritorious, no matter how necessary—simply because we do not have the courage to stand up before the threats of an armed army. And that, to our, we are doing here this day.
Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today in the closing hours of the 188th year of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we are witnessing the christright bill becoming real. You and my other colleagues know my position well on this matter. For during the last year while this bill has been before the Congress, I have risen here on the floor many times to argue its passage.

I have tried in every way I could to convince my colleagues of the apparent and hidden dangers of the civil rights bill, but I and others who opposed and still oppose this bill are being labeled as laggards. The Greek hero who could almost, but not quite, reach the fruit or the water outside his prison cell. We have almost been in reach of your understanding, but the tide of opinion has swept away the fruits of our labor.

The only recourse open for my dissent in this situation is by legislation to revoke the wrong that has been done. I have taken the first step in that direction this morning by introducing a bill that would require the civil rights issue to be submitted to the people of this land for advisory referendum.

Action to this end seems only right to me. The bill, which is the one that the people are the ones whose lives will be changed by it. And many, many people have written me urging opposition, while only a token few are for the bill. Below I am inserting a recent letter which expresses such opposition; a letter expressing how millions feel, yet who have not been able to express it nearly so well.

ATMORE, ALA., June 20, 1964.

Hon. GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: With the passage of the civil rights bill by the Senate, our Nation has witnessed in a little more than two decades a second day of infamy. The flight on behalf of constitutional government waged by the few is the only recourse open for my dissent in this situation is by legislation to revoke the wrong that has been done.
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hotel, restaurant, theater, or amusement place according to the dictates of his own conscience. In short, he is no longer a free agent—in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

This bill attacks the foundations of our Constitution; it destroys the freedom for which many have died. It hands to the Attorney General powers which object will be to work against the majority of the people of this country at the behest of minority pressure groups. These groups will call the shots; they will choose the places where the agents who will roam the countryside in search of litigation. It will establish a bureaucracy whose object will be to work against the majority of the people of this country at the behest of minority pressure groups.

Never in the history of this Congress has a bill been railroaded as this one has.

The original administration bill came to the House Judiciary Committee and hearings were held. Then, because of the lack of hearings, minority groups a “blank check” to demonstrate, harass and agitate, and guarantees that the Federal Government will stand behind them in doing it. It gives to the Attorney General power to do what is not within the duty to act responsibly and within the confines of the Constitution of the United States. Reasonable men may differ on their interpretation of that great instrument. But those of us who oppose this bill take our position in the light of sound and long-settled interpretations of constitutional liberty. Few people object to the goal that all Americans should enjoy the fruits of constitutional liberty. But it is a major paradox of our time that the bill before us today, although ostensibly proposed in the name of conscience, is a grotesque hoax upon all the people, par ticularly minority groups. This bill is a dangerous step in the direction of giving the Federal Government power over the people. It gives the Federal Government power over the people.

If I am to continue to call my conscience my own, I must raise in protest against it. It is a duty of Congress, no less than the President and the members of the Supreme Court, to have a duty to act responsibly and within the
The constitutional government as we have known it. The first is title II, the so-called public accommodations title. This is based on the constitutional power granted Congress to regulate commerce among the several States. As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I can say that for many years it has been my responsibility to understand and seek solutions to the problems under the clause of the Constitution. Over the years, my duties have brought me into confrontation with the application of the congressional commerce power to hundreds of practical problems. Yet never in my experience have I encountered a legislative proposal which goes as far beyond the granted power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce as is contained in title II of the bill before us today. Never before has Congress undertaken to trample so heavily on the rights of private property owners. Never before has it seemed necessary to expose the vast majority of our population to injunctive and criminal penalties for participating in the destruction of a way of life. An organized minority has once again proved that it is stronger than a confused, naive majority.

And if an organized minority can achieve what is about to be accomplished in this Nation, then those who love the America of their fathers and their forefathers had better heed the warnings of those of us who are opposed to what is contained in this so-called civil rights bill. On the 4th day of July, we are told that the President may sign this bill into law. If so, what a travesty on the history of our independence.

On the same day when our Nation celebrates the declaration of our independence in a union of 13 sovereign States, we are told the President may sign into a law a bill that will destroy almost the last semblance of State sovereignty. Do you recall the words of Richard Henry Lee who moved, in 1776 in the colonies are and of right ought to be independent States'? This was the resolution that was adopted; this is what we celebrate on the Fourth of July; and this is what may be destroyed on the Fourth of July 1964.

I can only express the fervent prayer that those charged with the responsibility for administering this law-to-be will recognize and respect the power that is bestowed them. Every segment of American commerce, American industry, American agriculture, and even the customs and mores of the people are subject to the broad reaches of this bill that is about to become law.

Sensible, intelligent, patient, and understanding men may keep this law from becoming the poison of our own destruction—but sensible, intelligent, patient, and understanding men who are forced to stand by and see the degradation of success-drunkened minorities, or to the plaintive pleas of propagandists, or pusillanimous politicians will destroy this Nation as surely as there will be a sunrise tomorrow.

Heed my words well—this is the most dangerous legislation ever enacted into law.

The South has once again been bludgeoned into submission—but this time the South will not confine its police activities to the South. Every State—or perhaps now our States should be called political subdivisions—will feel the weight and might of Federal power. The reaction from Wisconsin, Maryland, Indiana, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Maine may eventually lead to a new chapter of reconstruction. Perhaps in the destruction of our way of life, perhaps in the sacrifice of the South, the American majority may awaken to the grave responsibility, but their responsibility is to all Americans and if they are to act in behalf of the Federal Government—Americans—the Americas of the majority may react in a manner that may surprise some of the most outspoken advocates of civil rights.

To those who are about to assume the awesome responsibility of dictating the destinies of all Americans, I say—proceed with caution—call back your agitators—be humble in your victory—be modest in your exploitation—or the monster you have created may turn upon you.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, 100 percent when he tells the American people this civil rights bill is unconstitutional. I agree with him when he tells the people of these 50 States that this bill is a product of organized groups who are well paid for their activities and who will not permit the law to function successfully because they want to continue the strife and discord to maintain their jobs.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, extremists of the so-called civil rights movement already have threatened that, upon passage of this unnecessary, far-reaching, and dangerous legislation, they will begin massive agitation in cities of the South. It is clear that by so doing these extremists will extend their operations away from the festerling lawlessness which increasingly plagues northern and eastern communities.

Never has the hypocrisy of the northern and eastern press in its coverage of events in the South been so transparent as in its current handling of racial and crime news. For while reporters and commentators from New York City have descended on the plane load upon the State of Mississippi, the real violence of this long, hot summer is taking place right in their own Manhattan backyard. As a prime example of this journalistic sham, I have here a copy of the June 24, 1964, edition of the ultraliberary New York Post. The front page and lead editorial of this edition of the Post are devoted to the current situation in Mississippi. Writes the Post, I quote: "There is neither law nor order in Mississippi." And on page 8 of the same edition appears a story headlined—I quote: "Violence is the Rule."
Post that rails about the intolerable legal and moral climate of Mississippi, we can read about the state of the most fundamental of human and civil rights—that is, the right to life. Mississippi is the line drawn in the sand, the presumed paradise of law and order, New York City.

Let us open the June 24, 1964, edition of the New York Post—the same edition that says that there is no law and order and that there is the rule in Mississippi to page 2. Here we have a story headlined: “DA Grilling Mitchell on Story of Beating.” The story concerns the trial of a man accused of stabbing a 15-year-old girl half-a-dozen times while she slept in her own bedroom nearby her parents. According to the Post story, a defense witness called in this case was the Negro accused of having viciously killed a woman in full view of an entire neighborhood of onlookers. In this case, the Negro has been given national and even international attention, although the Post and similar journals have yet to be heard to complain about this aspect of New York City life damaging our foreign relations. Moreover, the Negro has frequent charge they direct at Southern States and communities.

Opposite page 2, on page 3 of this same edition of the New York Post, we have two headlines pertinent to the question of the state of law and order in New York City. Headline No. 1, and I quote: “Cops Ask Public’s Aid in Hunt for the Sniper.” This story concerns the sniper-killing of an 18-year-old girl in the parking lot near Times Square. An insect urges anyone who has information about the sniper-slaying to call a special police telephone number to relay it. Says the story: “The special phone will be manned 24 hours a day and all information will be kept confidential.”

I do not have to detail what the New York Post would be saying if the same tragic incident had occurred in any southern community and the same plea for their own safety had to be run in local southern newspapers. We would, no doubt, be reading in this ultraliberal journal about the reign of terror existing in the South, where citizens allegedly in fear of their lives had to be urged to call a special police number if they had information that might aid in the tracking of the guilty party or parties. But the Post is not heard to comment about the growing reign of terror in its own community. Instead, it hypocritically and self-righteously denounces alleged violence and lack of law and order in distant Mississippi.

Yet, that is not all the news concerning New York’s reign of terror appearing in this edition of the Post. Beneath this story of the sniper-killing, on page 3, the Post headlines: “Arraign Suspect in Park Slaying.” This story concerns the fatal stabbing of a man, unidentified, in Central Park, and the arrest of a suspect.

And, on page 4 of the same edition of the Post, there is a story headlined: “Women’s Lives Under Tongue in Shoot.” This story concerns the discovery of the scorched body of an unidentified woman in a Canarsie auto junkyard. The automobile was burned. Let me quote from the story:

“Asked if the fire was started by a burning cigarette, the captain said: ‘It looks much more suspicious than that’.”

Thus, in four pages of the New York Post, June 24, 1964, edition, we read about no less than five violent deaths of a group of people whom this same edition of the New York Post would create rather than solve problems, our racial problems had best take a good look in the mirror at their own community problems. The insincerity, the self-righteous, and the professional agitator will not do this, of course, for there are always those in our society more interested in exploiting problems for their own selfish ends than in solving them for the public good. Thus, the Post that rails about the civil rights extremists in Mississippi—but there are no marchers to protest the senseless killings and muggings and acts of violence that every day transpire in New York City and infringe on the fundamental rights of decent citizens there.

The legislation being considered by the House today is the end product of this irresponsible philosophy. Its passage will create rather than solve problems, as a matter of fact, in the whole area of racial problems, this bill has been on the defensive for some time. But this is a political year, gentlemen; and, at a time when the national elections could easily be decided on the issue of civil rights, this bill has become a tool for building the political edifice of the Roosevelt friends and those northerners and professional agitators who want to further sow more seeds of strife and hate.

As a matter of fact, in the whole area of racial problems, and certainly the bill on which we are preparing to pass judgment, there is a missing element which says, “That is the final ironic note appearing in the New York City.”

Last year I appeared before the House Committee on the Judiciary and made an appeal for considering what I considered the intangible and deeply embedded problems of man’s attitude toward his fellow
I would like to repeat that testimony, because I feel it even more keenly today as this bill comes close to being this summer—what is so badly needed—and vocational training. I believe that this can best be done by the local communities themselves because it is the local areas that know best what the educational needs and problems are and can best solve these at the local level. However, the States are seriously handicapped in their efforts for lack of enough funds. Most taxes collected now go to the Federal Government. It appears to me that there is no logical reason why the States cannot have the benefit of some of this great source of tax money within its own borders to help solve its educational problems. It seems to me that if this country is to continue to prosper and grow and meet the needs of this fast-moving space age, I feel strongly that our whole educational system needs upgrading—elementary, secondary, college, technical, and vocational training. I believe that this can best be done by the local communities themselves because it is the local areas that know best what the educational needs and problems are and can best solve these at the local level.

I, like most of my fellow Louisianians, I am today appealing to the sense of fair play and independence of thought and action. I fear it may stifle those voices forever.

The leaders of the major civil rights groups have already declared war on reason and order. They have promised to spend this summer "testing" the willingness of the people to obey this law. If any person needs proof that what they are interested in is riots, not rights, the statements of these self-appointed leaders should be ample evidence.

We will have reached a point of no return with the passage of this bill, a point beyond which our Constitution, our Congress, our very form of Western civilization will be forever changed. The street program, which has brought slavery a hundred years ago, can show himself a responsible citizen, take the gains which he has captured during these long, bitter months and become a better, more productive member of society. He is one of intellectual vagabonds and privateers, and protected by the might of the Federal Government, he can mount a 20th-century crusade against the "infidels" of the South and elsewhere, drawing tight the line of outside interference.

If they choose to follow the urging of the fanatics in their ranks, the Negro citizens will find nothing but disillusionment as the fruit of their labors.

I believe also, that the prospect of a referendum would be a warning to the civil rights groups to conduct themselves in an orderly, lawful manner, and to face any possible public rejection of their cause.
The request I am making is fair to everyone involved; and it is particularly needed in view of the important changes that we have seen in civil rights legislation in the last decade. I believe that the House is ready to take this step.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which I am confident will pass today.

Final passage of the civil rights bill today is only the beginning, not the end. Enforcement will increase, not abate, the demand for equal rights now.

Many citizens in this country believe that much of the lack of understanding, racial tension, and violence that have plagued this country in the past 10 years in the civil rights field stems from the fact that following the historic desegregation decision in 1954 no attempt was made to create a consensus of support. Had such an attempt been made, many tragic events might have been prevented.

The 1954 decision taught us that the mere judicial pronouncement of a rule of law is not enough. In 1964 mere passage of a bill, important though that may be, is not enough. As President Johnson said recently: "Laws do not create moral convictions."

But the enactment of the civil rights law will provide a historic opportunity to muster public opinion, awaken the conscience of the nation, and create moral conviction in the hearts of the people of America.

It seems to me that the most effective way this great effort could be launched would be the calling by President Johnson of a White House Conference on Human Rights with representatives from each of the 50 States. Following this there should be conferences in the States and finally in the cities, towns, and villages across the Nation. It would be a vast national town meeting.

What would be the purposes of the conferences? I think they would be threefold:

First. To inform the people of what the bill does and, almost equally important, what it does not do.

Second. To give civil rights leaders across the Nation the opportunity to impress upon their followers the idea that, under the new law, the courts instead of the streets may be the best places for the redress of grievances.

Third. To give to minority groups a forum in which to air grievances and to explain to majority groups the depth and texture of the problems they face and to permit members of majority groups to understand and fully accept the meaning of equality for, as President Kennedy said a little over a year ago, the problem "must be solved in the homes of every American and in every community across our country."

In the great educational campaign now needed, different groups will have differing roles to play.

The universities and the foundations have a significant role to play. The universities can offer their facilities for the holding of civil rights conferences.

The foundations can provide much of the needed financing.

Already the U.S. Conference of Mayors has given us a good example of a pattern for many civic associations to follow. In May of this year, the mayors' conference held workshop meetings on civil rights and what must be done after the law goes into effect. The mayors' conference and many associations are considering including topics dealing with civil rights at the various State conferences held regularly by the State leagues of municipalities.

The comments of the conference of mayors are consistent with President Johnson's statement that:

"This bill is intended to help our communities find peaceful solutions to problems of human relations. Many of these communities have asked for the provisions in this bill so that the same standards can be applied to all businesses serving the public, and assurance that public funds will be administered equitably. None of these provisions in this bill would create preferential treatment for one race or another. This would be a direct violation of the bill itself."

All that this bill will do is to see to it that the law will provide a historic opportunity to advance non-discrimination in employment in the steel industry.

For some time, the steel industry and the United Steelworkers have been working on the problems of the integration of the industry. This agreement was the work of a joint human relations committee cochairs by Mr. R. Conrad Cooper, executive vice president, personnel services, of the United States Steel Corp. and Mr. David J. McDevitt, president of the United Steelworkers.

Educators and education have a vital role if we are to have a nationwide understanding of our responsibilities under the new civil rights law. The professional and academic organizations ranging from the Phi Beta Kappa Society to the county teacher organizations should aid in bringing us the intellectual comprehension and understanding which must permeate the country. It must be borne in mind that laws and government are at best inadequate instruments for remaking social institutions. Education must illuminate the dark places of the human heart. The law can guard against segregation in schools but it cannot prevent the thousands of incidents of discrimination and hatred which give lie to what is learned in the classroom.

Finally, I recognize the great role that American churchmen of all faiths have played in the contemporary battle for civil rights. Perhaps more than any other single group in America, they will have a continuing role to play. I think they should be represented in every conference. President Johnson recently spoke to a group of churchmen. He said:

"It is your job as prophets in our time to dream the impossible, to choose the right in shaping the conduct and thoughts of men toward their brothers in a manner consistent with compassion and love. So help us in this choice, and help us in the application of this choice."

I think the task ahead is clear. Our historic experience teaches us that when the American people know and understand they will rise to the occasion of history.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, though the hour is late and the vote hardly in doubt, I cannot pass up this final opportunity to speak out against the misnamed "Civil Rights Act of 1964."

This bill grants dictatorial, gestapo-like authority to officials and agents of the Federal Government. They will be able to go out among the people, openly or incognito, to select victims to be the objects of their police power. Having thus picked out a fit subject for their predatory activities, they then define the charges and proceed against him. Even Adolf Hitler had less legal sanction than the Attorney General will have under this bill.

In every respect the plastic encroachment by the Federal bureaucracy upon fundamental rights of private citizens of every race and creed to hold and control private property and to choose his craft or trade in business as well as social institutions.

But there is an undercurrent, a back-lash of fear and opposition in every State of the United States, particularly where there are large, concentrated Negro populations. Where there are no such Negro populations, there is less concern, but there is still some everywhere.

Several forces or factors have combined to generate this fear and concern. Despite the great measure of public approval of the new civil rights law, the lawless demonstrations have continued, spread and intensified, making it increasingly apparent that legislation is not the answer and, indeed, will not be accepted as the solution by many people who are agitating loudest for it. The people in every section of the country have had opportunity to learn and study the proposed legislation. They have come to realize that the Federal Government is about to poke its nose into every phase of their private lives, their businesses, their labor unions, their social institutions and in their homes.

Many of these citizens of the North and South have made known their concern by such means as was available to them. They have counterdemonstrated against the lawless, community-paralyzing, racial demonstrations. They have raised their voices and their protests. They have asked the Congress not to pass the bill. They have asked the Congress to use its power to tear down customary neighborhood patterns and school districts to accommodate local agitators. They have opposed block grants and have asked the government to help high school students who are threatened or actually destroyed property values. They have written to their Congressmen. And many of them have voted for Alabama's courageous Governor, George Wallace.
I am aware that under the bill de facto segregation in the North will remain while Federal agents swarm over the South to force and enforce actual integration. This is because the bill permits the Northern States to use as a defense against Federal invasion their so-called equal accommodations, fair employment laws, and open-school regulations, which in most cases merely serve to exempt the Northern States from the harsh effects of the Federal law.

I am also aware that many northern Representatives and Senators have assured their constituents by correspondence and newsletters that their fears are ungrounded because the bill will apply to the South only.

Thus it is an open secret, halfheartedly denied if at all, that this bill is directed at the South. Thus that greatest of all minority groups—the southern white—becomes the official scapegoat of the minority voting blocs in the big cities of the North, Midwest, and West.

I call, for want of a better term, the element of hypocrisy has played an important role in the development and passage of this legislation. That may be true. But there is also a strong element of that strange human behavior which I call, in better terms, the psychology of distant misery. This un-fathomable trait in human beings blinds them to problems at close range while magnifying those at a distance.

And is this the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

This eye for distant misery could be amusing if it were not so often tragic. Nevertheless, it permits many of our meddling friends to overlook the jungles of the North, where savages in the streets, parks, and subways, mauling and murdering innocent citizens, while making pious speeches about racial matters in the South.

Representatives and Senators of those who wrote it, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a punitive, oppressive measure aimed at the South. We have an opportunity to kill it now. It will be more difficult to repeal here than the 1960’s is handed to the South in the civil rights bill of the 1960’s. It is a new Reconstruction.

The South faced the old Reconstruction, persevered, survived, and prospered. Of all the qualities of the southern people, perseverance is the deepest, strongest, and most enduring. The South will persevere.

According to reports President Johnson has considered the recordation of his approval and official signing of this force bill to take place on Independence Day, the 4th day of July. If this is an effort to make of our President a second Abra­ham Lincoln, with a view to get another traveler, or a job for each according to his skill or strength, but it will multiply the total expense of the whole thing badly done or perfectly done, but it is well begun. In the passing of recent events and the adoption of this law, the country will not violently change. It is just getting better for all people.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day. As a student of law, I have never dreamed that the day would ever come when more than two-thirds of the Congress Senate and the House of Representatives that this history legislation originated. It was here in this House, whose Members are so close to the people they represent, where the bill received its first resounding vote of approval—a vote which reflected the deepest convictions of our people. So it is right that it should be here in this House that the civil rights bill will receive the final expression of the people’s sanction on its way to becoming the law of the land.

It seems appropriate, too, Mr. Speaker, that we should take this action virtually on the eve of Independence Day, this the 186th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. What our forefathers began in Phila­delphia on July 4, 1776—in the prelude to the Declaration of Independence—we are perpetuating today. What our forefathers began in the 4th day of July, the 188th anniversary of the sign­ning of the Declaration of Independence. What our forefathers began in Phila­delphia on July 4, 1776—in the prelude to the Declaration of Independence—we are perpetuating today.

As we all know in our hearts, Mr. Speaker, what we do today will not be the end of the struggle for human and civil rights in America. Just as with the Constitution, enactment of the civil Rights Bill is the beginning of a new era in our life as a free people—an era which will test the adequacy of our re­sources of tolerance and good will and understanding and require from all of us the deepest respect for the prin­ciples of freedom and justice.

This bill is a good and a just bill. I trust we can make it work.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1964, I stated in the House of Representatives that the civil rights bill will not provide instant brotherhood, a room at every inn for every weary traveler, or a job for each according to his skill or strength, but it will multiply the total expense of the whole thing badly done or perfectly done, but it is well begun. In the passing of recent events and the adoption of this law, the country will not violently change. It is just getting better for all people.
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The House of Africa, the African Congo, each with its own problem. Yes, and I saw the representatives of these other groups for whose vote we must bid, and I am proud that the people of my section only, they need only to be told by beyond the power of such States, but rather have been held to be within the power of the Federal Government move its force in our behalf. And I have seen the avowed purpose of testing existing laws. What if it were the law against murder they wished to test, or rape, or treason? Is there one rule in the Federal Government for laws the executive or the judiciary likes and another for the laws they do not like? My friends, power breeds desire for power. No dictator ever stopped short of taking it all. This concentration of supreme power in our Supreme Court, backed by the Federal Executive, will not stop with school and public facility integration, nor with race. Once seized, this power will be used to control industry, to control agriculture; yes, and eventually, our international relations.

In Russia everyone is supposed to own everything. However, for all practical purposes everything may as well belong to the Communist leaders, who control according to their own desires. In our country, if the present trend continues, it will not simply be the Chief Justice, the President, or even the Attorney General who issues orders; it will be everyone who speaks in the big chief's name. So it is with power and so it will continue to be, for the basic traits of human nature do not change. 

WEAKNESS

Several years ago I was at the opening session of the United Nations. I saw Khrushchev as he virtually ran the length of the floor to embrace Castro, then they had been together at morning. Yes, and I saw the representatives of Africa, the African Congo, each with a vote, though many of them represented virtually unrecognised and seated there at the invitation of another group for whose vote we must bid, not once and for all but on every issue as it arises.

Today the United States has moved into almost every country which would let us in. We have granted funds and goods to foreign governments, which in turn sold such goods to their own people for what the traffic will bear. We extended this foreign aid primarily on the promise, but many times merely in the hope, that incumbent governments would support our wishes. Through this means we have made a few pawns rich here and abroad. In many of these nations we have forced them to take on our ways, to the point many countries are virtually defenseless, both from revolution within or from enemy attack from without.

Not since the Civil War have our people faced a more trying time. The attack on the Constitution and on our way of life is insidious. It comes under the guise of government. It is offered with an appeal to the natural tendency of Americans to be law abiding. It appeals to religion, is presented to us as a peace offering, but creates strife, dissension, and disturbance. It is said to be necessary to protect the rights of individuals, but is itself based on usurpation of power. We are told to maintain our form of government; yet its starting point is the destruction by Judicial decree of the rights of the States, of the Congress, and of the people. Yes, it begins with destruction of the Constitution itself. It can only lead to complete ruin.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run we must permit local self-government in our own Nation to reflect local views and meet local needs. We must return to a form of government which permits the peoples of other nations to run their own affairs. If we do not approve such a course in foreign fields, the peoples of foreign areas will not be satisfied, and we will continue to be the loser. If we do not return to such a commonsense course in our own Nation, dictatorship will be followed by dictatorship, and all we have has it is necessary here. An authoritarian state can force the American people into a common denominator, Russian style, each of an exact shade of brown, each conforming to the dictates of an all-powerful Federal Government. Our people are too independent for that. We must allow for differences. If not, differences will destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, to those here who believe that this measure will satisfy present agitators, I say it will only begin agitation. To those who believe it will affect my section only, they need only to look to the dynamite and lighted fuse in practice, to every northern city. I am proud that the people of my section are showing real self-restraint under trying circumstances. I hope time will show you who support this bill, that you will understand the fact of the Supreme Court went beyond this Nation down the road to state socialism are wrong; and that the present judicial dictatorship of the Supreme Court, supported by the executive dictatorship of the President, this Congress, is all wrong and that this act will be repealed; that the rights of individuals to accumulate and control one's own property, the right to choose one's own customers, one's own companions and one's friends, regardless of color will be reestablished. Only then, Mr. Speaker, will our Nation endure. Yes, and I saw the representatives of supreme legislative conscience and duty I most earnestly urge and hope this Senate-amended version of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which we passed yesterday, will be unanimously accepted and approved.

The work the Senate performed on this measure follows the general lines of the House bill we acted upon here and there is no substantial alteration of the principles of equality embodied in the original measure. An overwhelming majority of both Chambers, as representatives of the American people, have already, in substance, approved this measure. In patriotic unity let us all close ranks and pass this bill.

For our inspiration toward this action we may timely remind ourselves of the immortal words of our late President John F. Kennedy when he urged: 'For our journey is not to the Orient, about 1965, to pass a comprehensive civil rights law. On that occasion President Kennedy appealed to the Congress with these words:

Justice requires us to insure the peace of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic expediency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquility—but, above all, because it is right. This measure will not, nor was it ever pretended that it could, resolve all of our racial problems. Such will not occur until each of us applies the lesson taught centuries ago, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; only when this measure, unconditionally, lets us all close ranks and pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run we must permit local self-government in our own Nation to reflect local views and meet local needs. We must return to a form of government which permits the peoples of other nations to run their own affairs. If we do not approve such a course in foreign fields, the peoples of foreign areas will not be satisfied, and we will continue to be the loser. If we do not return to such a commonsense course in our own Nation, dictatorship will be followed by dictatorship, and all we have has it is necessary here. An authoritarian state can force the American people into a common denominator, Russian style, each of an exact shade of brown, each conforming to the dictates of an all-powerful Federal Government. Our people are too independent for that. We must allow for differences. If not, differences will destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, to those here who believe that this measure will satisfy present agitators, I say it will only begin agitation. To those who believe it will affect my section only, they need only to look to the dynamite and lighted fuse in practice, to every northern city. I am proud that the people of my section are showing real self-restraint under trying circumstances. I hope time will show you who support this bill, that you will understand the fact of the Supreme Court went beyond this Nation down the road to state socialism are wrong; and that the present judicial dictatorship of the Supreme Court, supported by the executive dictatorship of the President, this Congress, is all wrong and that this act will be repealed; that the rights of individuals to accumulate and control one's own property, the right to choose one's own customers, one's own companions and one's friends, regardless of color will be reestablished. Only then, Mr. Speaker, will our Nation endure. Yes, and I saw the representatives of supreme legislative conscience and duty I most earnestly urge and hope this Senate-amended version of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which we passed yesterday, will be unanimously accepted and approved.

The work the Senate performed on this measure follows the general lines of the House bill we acted upon here and there is no substantial alteration of the principles of equality embodied in the original measure. An overwhelming majority of both Chambers, as representatives of the American people, have already, in substance, approved this measure. In patriotic unity let us all close ranks and pass this bill.

For our inspiration toward this action we may timely remind ourselves of the immortal words of our late President John F. Kennedy when he urged: 'For our journey is not to the Orient, about 1965, to pass a comprehensive civil rights law. On that occasion President Kennedy appealed to the Congress with these words:

Justice requires us to insure the peace of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic expediency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquility—but, above all, because it is right. This measure will not, nor was it ever pretended that it could, resolve all of our racial problems. Such will not occur until each of us applies the lesson taught centuries ago, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; only when this measure, unconditionally, lets us all close ranks and pass this bill.

For God, for country, for our fellow Americans and for men everywhere, let us not shrink from the challenge of our destiny. For our inspiration toward this action we may timely remind ourselves of the immortal words of our late President John F. Kennedy when he urged: 'For our journey is not to the Orient, about 1965, to pass a comprehensive civil rights law. On that occasion President Kennedy appealed to the Congress with these words:

Justice requires us to insure the peace of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic expediency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquility—but, above all, because it is right. This measure will not, nor was it ever pretended that it could, resolve all of our racial problems. Such will not occur until each of us applies the lesson taught centuries ago, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; only when this measure, unconditionally, lets us all close ranks and pass this bill.
need for congressional reform. When it takes over 1 year to enact urgent legislation, the need for change is obvious. I hope the public has been sufficiently aroused to demand it.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will begin the end of our heritage—a pledge which guarantees equality and justice to all of our citizens. It is before us today because of the civil rights revolution which is sweeping America, a revolution which in the long run will make all men free regardless of race, creed, or color. The dedicated and courageous activities of thousands upon thousands of Americans, many of whom are young, have brought Congress to the point of enacting the most comprehensive civil rights bill in our history. The path to this point in our history is covered with the courage of those who were at Albany, Ga.; Oxford, Miss.; Cambridge, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; and now Philadelphia, Miss., to mention only a few battlefields of the second American Revolution which will be recorded in history along with Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. And let us not forget the countless citizens who have participated in the sit-ins, freedom rides, boycotts, rent strikes, picketing, and other civil rights demonstrations all over this land. They have put their lives and lives on the line for freedom deserve special credit.

While it is a comprehensive bill, it is, in fact, a moderate measure which falls short of meeting the challenge of racial equality. As my friend, the Senator from Georgia, H.R. 7152 is both weaker in some instances and stronger in other instances than the House bill. I would like to mention briefly some of the major differences.

In title I, the House bill permitted the States to give oral literacy tests upon request of an applicant. The Senate bill requires that literacy tests be written unless the applicant requests them in writing with agreement from a State permitting oral tests. Another Senate change permits a request for a three-judge court to be made only in suits in which the Attorney General has requested the court to find a pattern or practice of voting discrimination.

The House bill would have permitted such requests in any voting rights suit brought by the Attorney General. The first change probably strengthens the bill. The second weakens it to some extent.

In title II, the Senate left the coverage of the House bill unchanged reaching the same public accommodations. The same acts of discrimination are made unlawful.

The Senate bill still permits an aggrieved individual to sue but adds a provision authorizing the court to appoint an attorney general to obtain such relief as it deems necessary, at the expense of the party on whose behalf suit is brought. It would take a long time to describe all of the changes the Senate made in title VII, the equal employment opportunity title. The net effect of them is much like the changes made in title II. On charges filed with the Commission, States with fair employment laws are given up to 60 days to resolve them—or 120 days during the first year after a State enacts such a law. If the problem is not resolved during this period, an aggrieved individual may sue, and the court may permit the Attorney General to intervene upon timely application. Although the Commission is no longer authorized to bring a court action, the Attorney General can do so whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that an individual or group is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance intended to deprive the full exercise of equal employment opportunities.

An amendment of major significance is the provision in title XI which allows the accused in any proceeding for criminal contempt, arising under any of the titles except the one on voting rights, to demand a jury trial. This will undermine the bill and the traditional powers of the Federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a meaningful measure, but it should go further.

The voting rights title should extend to State elections and eliminate literacy tests, as I have advocated on previous occasions.

Title II should have a salutary effect on those establishments it reaches. But Congress, through the commerce power, can reach much farther than it has in title II. There is no reason to permit racial discrimination in any kind of establishment which has an effect on commerce.

It is shocking that, at this late date, so much of our racial strife is attributable to the failure of Congress to implement the equal use of their public facilities, including parks, golf courses, public pools. St. Augustine and other communities should have realized before now that public facilities must be open to all the public regardless of race, creed, or color. Under title III the Attorney General must use his authority to sue to desegregate such facilities and use it freely, just as he must use freely his authority to intervene in or initiate actions under the education and employment titles of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined some of the changes between the Senate bill and the bill which passed the House. Neither version fully faces up to the enormous challenge of establishing racial equality in this Nation. We have a long way to go before the problems which the civil rights bill attempts to ameliorate are in fact solved. In fact, it may very well take further legislation to ensure fully the right to vote, the right to enter all public accommodations, and the right to vote.

This bill does not deal with the problems caused by the fact that the Negro has been disadvantaged for over 100 years—the problems of education, employment, and housing. The bill is solved only by a massive commitment by our society to the elimination of poverty. The administration's antipoverty bill is a small and tentative beginning. But we must move our society much further toward the realization of our ideals. The day must come when all Americans share in the American dream. By voting for the civil rights bill today, we hasten that day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this bill will bring only grief to Negro Americans.

The die is cast and I realize the futility of my remarks at this late hour; but I cannot let the occasion pass without appealing to our people as Americans.

If the veil of demagoguery were torn from the environment of this bill, there would stand revealed the stark fact that this measure endorses the Congress of the United States.

Those who support this bill will carry the shame of the ages with them on the irreversible course charted by political
exploiters of human freedom. The price for this collapse of reason will be paid in the streets, parks, and arenas in northern cities as well as in the South. The mobs, whipped to fanatical fervor by Negro racists, will extract their will of life, liberty, and happiness among the white population.

With the passage of this misnamed civil rights bill, we are embarking on an era of mob rule—of mass emotion. Leaders of the mob will not be pacified. They will be back for more punitive legislation because their appetite is insatiable.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on the Judiciary, in the Rules Committee, and in the House, we have seen how a ruthless majority can crush a minority. When the full impact of this bill hits the American people, those advocating this desperate grab for power will be in the minority.

I think the House should reflect on the indisputable fact that the most ardent support of this legislation has come from the Communist Party. That, alone, borders on the treasonable. Chaos will be the after­math and racial strife will dominate the Fourth of July.

The passage by the Congress of this historic civil rights bill in 1964, approximately 188 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, is another example of how the United States must continue to put into effect the virtue of the dignity and freedom of all men.

The civil rights issue is basic to everything that is American.

In the same manner that we fought our country, we now reaffirm our strength in our great heritage, our freedom and faith in the inherent right of all men to secure life and liberty together with the pursuit of happiness.

I am pleased to once again offer my full support to this civil rights legislation, and to follow its course as law of the United States.

The battle—which is never ending—will continue to rage on. Let us hope that, as Abraham Lincoln once said, we can bind up the Nation's wounds and that, "whenever there is a conflict between human rights and property rights, human rights must prevail."

With millions of other Americans, I dedicate myself to this great and noble cause.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that in the name of civil rights, this travesty is about to be inflicted upon the American people. The manner in which it is coming before the House today can only forcibly remind us of the mob rule that was allowed to be encountered by the House in February, was railroaded through the Judiciary Committee without discussion, debate, or possibility of amendment.

This so-called debate today is a farce, and nothing else. One hour is allotted, and it is controlled by the proponents of the bill, who are here asking the House to vote for a new bill, without knowing what is in it—and obviously, the majority that is here are going to do so, in response to the jerk of a string, without consideration of the results following this action.

We have here an entirely new bill, which has not been considered by the House. This measure contains some 70 pages, and some 80 differences between it and the bill as passed the House in February. This new bill came to us from the Senate only last week, and the majority limit the debate to 1 hour; this is less than 1 minute for each page of the bill, and, of course, a page cannot even be read in 1 minute, leaving aside the lack of discussion and explanation.

It is apparent that the majority of the House is willing to take this bill, sight unseen, and impose its totalitarian provisions upon the people of this country. Therefore, I want to use this time to register my objection to this highhanded, undemocratic method of procedure.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, our freedom as a nation was won in 1776, on the Fourth of July.

The battle to achieve this great victory was not an easy one, and since freedom is something which has to be continually fought for, the battle goes on.

Freedom requires vigilance, and eternal courage.

When men fail, laws are necessary. And we continue to be a nation of laws; not one established on the whims of individuals.

The passage by the U.S. Congress of this historic civil rights bill in 1964, approximately 188 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, is another example of how the United States must continue to put into effect its virtue in the dignity and freedom of all men.

The civil rights issue is basic to everything that is American.

In the same manner that we fought our country, we now reaffirm our strength in our great heritage, our freedom and faith in the inherent right of all men to secure life and liberty together with the pursuit of happiness.

I am pleased to once again offer my full support to this civil rights legislation, and to follow its course as law of the United States.

The battle—which is never ending—will continue to rage on. Let us hope that, as Abraham Lincoln once said, we can bind up the Nation's wounds and...
into the affairs of millions of businessmen
and workers. Snoopers and informers
would flourish in every community of
our land. The conduct of businesses and
labor unions would come under Federal
dictation.

Mr. Speaker, the destiny of America,
past and present, has been shaped by a
working, healthy, free enterprise system.
In some instances, there has been helpful
government action but never such a cross
invasion by Federal authority as is contemplat
under title VII.

I should like to make direct reference,
Mr. Speaker, to one more section of this
act, that is, Section 601 of Title VI. It
stands to reason that I stand firmly opposed to each
and every title of the proposed measure.
Each is repugnant to me.

Title VI could properly be renamed the
"blacksplan title." In effect, this title says
in the words of one Member of this House:
You do as you are told by Washington or we will shut you off
from all Federal funds. If you practice
discrimination—and this broad term is not defined in the title—no more
money.

Here, indeed, is a most vicious piece
of legislation. It does not call for ac-
don the part of those local officials re-
sponsible for discrimination, but instead
will turn the Federal government against a
man, woman, and child in the area con-
cerned. The sick, the aged, and the in-
firm would be among the first to suffer.
And the schoolchildren and the destitute.
If we do not stop this, we shall be
charged with the shameful legislation,
totally un-American, totally ruthless,
totally heartless.

Taking the so-called Civil Rights Act
of 1964 as a whole, Mr. Speaker, I
would like to make this final and vital point.

This act strikes at the heart of an-
other minority—the white people of the
South. Where is their protection? This
act runs roughshod over the social cus-
toms and traditions of a great and loyal
section of this Nation. It undercuts the
sincerity attempts by conscientious people
of the South to find permanent solutions
for the serious social and economic prob-
lems facing the Negro today.

The South seeks racial peace just as
much as does the rest of the Nation.
Unhappily, I do not believe that the
Civil Rights Act of 1964 will achieve rac-
ial peace. And I believe this is the sad
and bitter fact that all Americans must
now face.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I
rise in support of H.R. 7152, the civil
rights bill. It is, without question, the most
important piece of legislation con-
sidered during the 88th Congress. Presi-
dent Johnson's signing of this measure
will culminate many years of struggle
and disappointment. It will forge the
last link in a chain of events which has
brought torment, despair, and, now suc-
cess.

The insults and indignities suffered
by those who have attempted to call atten-
tion to discriminatory practices were an
exorbitant price to pay. For the oppor-
tunities being sought were of the kind our
democratic theory demands as the simple
rights of citizenship. This is a second

Emancipation Proclamation in all but
name.

And yet, just as it signifies the end of
an era, it places a new perspective upon
upholding the rights of citizenship, oppor-
tunity, and equal protection of the law will
henceforth be extended to all people re-
gardless of race—as a matter of public
policy. Recourse to the courts is pro-
vided for in virtually every instance of sys-
tematic discrimination. We must make
certain that these gains are not now dis-
 sipated by unreasoning emotion.

Doubtless some members of all races
will ignore or seek to abuse the rights
granted. I am confident that they will
be insignificant in number; that those
who have opposed the bill's adoption will
now obey its moral and legal strictures;
that those who have done so much to
bring it about will rely upon the safe-
guards it provides.

Defiant protest is no longer in order.
The time for street demonstrations has
passed. The time has come for reliance
upon the sense of American justice.
The act runs roughshod over the social cus-
toms of the South to find permanent solutions
for the problems facing the Negro today.

Unhappily, I do not believe that the
right of citizenship. This is a second

The bill with the language of the Sen-
ate amendments is just as bad, perhaps
even worse, than the language of the bill
which passed the House of Representa-
tives in February of this year.

I opposed it then. I oppose it now, and
by my vote I have done that which I
could not prevent its enactment into law.
Accordingly, I shall vote "No" on the
pending resolution.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, 20 or 30
years from now I know, and I think you
do, too, that we will be able to say pride-
fully to our grandchildren that we were
part of these historic times when Amer-
ica moved forward in the direction of
ensuring constitutional rights and
equality of opportunity to all of her citi-
zens.

Americans then will remember the
civil rights law of 1964 with the same his-
toric importance we now give to the
Emancipation Proclamation of 1864.

Because our daily lives are deeply im-
mersed in these times of change, tension,
and turmoil, it is difficult for us to see
the significance of the progress we are
making.

In the long run, our children's children
will probably look back on these times
and wonder what all the fuss was about.
They will wonder why some of their
grandparents found it odd that every
citizen should have the same rights and
opportunities, and we will, too.

Mr. Speaker, our Union of States survived 188 years.

With hands bloody with the doing, we
wrested freedom from a tyrannical moth-
ner.

We survived the anguish of a fratrici-
cidal war.

We fought at Lexington and Concord,
at Chickamauga Creek and the Bloody
Angle, at Verdun and Ypres, at Quadas-
canal and Bastogne to preserve for our
children and all men the sacred freedom
to choose.

This golden thread, this freedom of
choice, was woven in the tapestry of our
country in so tight a skein that it could
not be unraveled without rending the
whole cloth.
But it has now been un velocidad with the passage of this bill and the cloth is rent.

On the eve of the 18th anniversary of our blessed, fruitful Union, it is being torn asunder by a handful of men whose appetite for political power and for self-preservation in office drove them to the madness of bartering this freedom to choose for the bloc vote of the Negro.

How shoddy, cheap, and shameful an end for something that was so glorious.

They have not given "rights" to the Negro; they have sold him "special privilegel in return for his vote. Caveat emptor.

The tiger will not be satisfied with steak. His gluttony will not be sated until he has killed and gorged himself on the whole animal.

There are those who think they are done with this subject now that this infamous bill is made into law.

But not so; the curtain has only begun to rise.

The indignation of the people is yet to come. Since the Negro by his own avalanche, they will learn what has been taken from them with this legislation. Their protest will roll over this Congress like a tidal wave.

I am glad I stand on the high ground; on the side of the people.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this bill now assured, we can only hope for the best but be prepared for the worst. Its enactment may very well trigger a wave of riots, bombings, race riots, and other outrages inspired by the racial agitators who support this legislation. Threats have already been made by some of the leaders in the movement. Triggerhappy recipients of this new and preferred treatment may feel that the Government is on their side, no matter what they do.

There are many lawabiding Negroes who practice restraint and moderation. But unfortunately many members of that race who are not lawabiding and who make trouble. Since the big sendoff for the drive that resulted in this bill's enactment, there has been a noticeable increase in crime committed by Negroes in many areas. The murder rate in Washington it has jumped up by more than 25 per cent during the past year. Many other cities are having a similar experience.

We know that many of the agitators who arouse the passions of the Negro populace have openly encouraged disobedience to local laws. We know that these agitators, including such leaders as Martin Luther King, have gone into many communities and inspired criminal actions by members of their race. Many others have done the same thing.

J. Edgar Hoover has said the Communists have had a hand in this.

But they have a good thing going. They are well paid. And now, with the passage of this bill, the agitators can be expected to intensify their actions and inspire more and more disobedience and disrespect for law and order.

Mr. Speaker, let us not deceive ourselves. In a manner of speaking, everyone who has had a hand in the passage of this legislation must share some of the responsibility for the consequences of what they have wrought.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this bill will be a disaster for Negroes, except for Federal enforcement jobs. The average Negro will still be dependent for employment on the good will and solicitude of white employers in his neighborhood. Negros who have been charged with all the force and compulsion given to enforcement agents, encouraged that good will? Or is it more likely to have the opposite effect? After all, jobs, better jobs, food for the family, and a decent house to live in are the chief interests of the average American Negro. They already have good schools in practically every community in the country. The passage of this bill will naturally reduce rather than enhance good will and job opportunities in the average community, and make no mistake about it.

Aside from the unfortunate effects on job opportunities and the encouragement of lawlessness, there is an avalanche heavy blow at constitutional government. It will destroy a hundred times more rights and freedoms than it will protect. With this law on the books, America will never be quite the same again.

We have heard a lot about Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse. Let us consider her problem for a moment. If she rents as many as five rooms, for any purpose, she is considered a landlord. Suppose Mrs. Murphy, who comes under the law, has a vacant room. The doorbell rings at 2 o'clock in the morning. She answers and is faced by a Negro man whose appearance raises doubts in her mind as to his intentions. If she denies him a room, what can happen under the terms of this law that is being enacted here today?

She may end up in jail. At least she will be subject to harassment if the Negro reports her and claims he was denied the room because of his race. She can be haled into court, and if she persists in using her own judgment about the desirability of patrons, may end up in jail.

In the South, a rejected room seeker is furnished a Government lawyer, at no cost, to prepare and prosecute his case against Mrs. Murphy. This bill so provides.

This is but one of the scores of boobytraps that are built into this legislation. Its enactment will open a Pandora box of court actions, court orders, injunctions, and prosecutions. This all smacks of the police state, certainly more so than we have ever experienced in free America before.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not belabor the issue. This bill has been thoroughly debated, at least in the Senate, although it has been steamrollered through the House, encumbered with scores of Senate amendments, under a gag rule that has allowed only 1 hour of debate.

As I said at the beginning, we can hope for the best but must be prepared for the worst. Let us hope that the Negro agitators, encouraged by Communist leaders, who are being silenced by members of their own race. But that has not been the case in the past and we can hardly hope for it in the future.

It is my firm belief that the enactment of this bill will cause a serious setback of progress in racial relations in this country. And this is being done because of what appears to be an insatiable desire to corral Negro bloc votes. It is being done at a price to pay for political advantages. And both major parties share in this scramble for Negro votes.

VIOLATES FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is being called upon to pass a bill which violates my fundamental concepts of American constitutional government.

I have asked before, and ask again, for the Members of this body to study this particular legislation. While it is glossed over in flowery tones by its proponents, this bill strikes at the very heart of our system of free enterprise.

When we tell a man how he must operate his private business, when we tell him how he will hire and fire his employees, then we are violating his fundamental rights under the Constitution. I have always felt that this was a government which has always guarded the belief that a man had the right to operate his business, his private property, with a minimum of control.

The basic difference between our system of government and that of the Communist nations is that here we recognize the right to own and operate private property. Under communism, the government tells the individual how his private property must be handled and claims ownership.

We may not always agree with how a man operates or controls that private property, but we recognized until this point that he had that right. On the highly dubious commerce clause of the Constitution, we have based a law which is absurd when reasonable legal standards are considered.

There may be imperfections in our system, but it has proven to be the soundest ever devised by man.

I predict that this bill will take away basic freedoms from men of all races, creeds, and colors. It is a bill which has paid little heed to the South. And both major parties share in its passage when the whole Nation has problems in race relations.

Passage of this bill will not solve those problems. They are deep rooted. Their solution will come with time and with emphasis on two areas—education and a healthy economy.

Education is needed to train and make useful citizens out of our deprived citizens, who for generation after generation have lived in the South with poverty. And after we have provided them with educations, we must have a healthy economy which can absorb them into productive and financially rewarding lives.

I believe that when we address ourselves to these two areas, then we will be making progress. And I do not believe that we will make any real progress until we meet these challenges.

I cannot with a clear conscience vote for this bill. I believe that we will make any real progress until we meet these challenges. I cannot with a clear conscience vote for this bill. I believe that we will make any real progress until we meet these challenges.
Today we see mob rule substituted for the rule of law. We see outsiders pouring into a community and in the name of the law, Florida and people. Outsiders from both sides pour into a besieged community and the local people are bewildered, incensed, maddened, and disgusted. But no voice is raised to help the people in other areas.

As Senator Russell said in a Senate speech last year, it has become a national disease for the people of the States on one side to despise the South. They know not what they are talking about, they never listen to the great areas of progress. The news media continually picture the South as an area of bumphkins, pointing out only the worst, and generally isolating very selected instances, and even inciting the incident themselves to get a picture of twisted story.

We have our problems to be sure. But other States have also. Race relations are a problem. This bill solves none of them. This bill in my opinion should be ruled unconstitutional, but I doubt if the Supreme Court as it is now constituted with 8 men they interpreted the Constitution just as they please, without regard to precedent, written law, the intent of the founders, or the will of the Congress.

My vote is only one. But it will be cast with a clear conscience for what I believe to be our constitutional way of life. I predict that the passage of this bill will be a serious mistake for this country on a transparent path of government control and direction. I urge that it not be passed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is substantially "Will the House recede and concur with the Senate bill on civil rights?" If a bill identical to the Senate bill were before the House for initial passage, I would vote against it. In my opinion, it contains provisions of very dubious constitutionality, and in many instances will probably create more problems than it will solve.

However, the choice we make today is whether to have a civil rights bill or not to have one at all. Since the body on the other hand have both adopted civil rights bills, there will be a law passed on this subject at this session of Congress. To me, it would be the most naive type of wishful thinking to believe that defeating this resolution and subsequently sending the bill to conference would keep it from becoming law. It has been well demonstrated that Congress will be kept in session until it passes a civil rights law.

A conference committee could only resolve the differences between the two bills. In my opinion, on balance, the Senate amendments make the bill more palatable, but not only because they provide for trial by jury and the application of local laws where they are in existence.

I voted against the civil rights bill when it was before the House. As I have stated, I have never voted for a civil rights bill if it were here as an original bill. However, the choice I must make is between these two bills. Since I find the Senate bill to be more palatable than the House, but also find another way the lesser of two evils, I shall vote "aye" on the resolution.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic moment in the House of Representatives. Today we are enacting legislation to assure the most prominent character of this Nation. By passing this bill we affirm ideals which were written into the Declaration of Independence, and we make it clear to ourselves and to the world that the very gap between promise and fulfillment.

This bill represents a very real victory not only because it assures a better America for more Americans but because the forces of a dynamic, forward-looking nation have defeated forces which in the past have been a blot on our national conscience. There are those who will continue to insist that this measure violates the traditional concept of property rights and represents an unlawful intrusion of the Federal Government into matters which are the concern of the several States. But the plain fact, Mr. Speaker, is that most Americans not only accept but insist that human rights and preeminence in our free society are the proper concern and responsibility of the Federal Government.

The Congress can be proud of the action it takes today, but the special gratitude of Americans for generations to come must be reserved for our late President whose inspiration and dedication has stamped itself upon this work. In truth, a bill signed into the law of the land shortly.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for the opponents of the opponents of the civil rights bill, we who favor its passage know that it is a foregone conclusion that the measure will pass today and will be signed into the law of the land shortly thereafter. It is now too late to debate the issue. All that need be said, pro or con, have been fully stated. The die is cast and no wiles or forecasts of doom is sound the day of doom.

We should, therefore, give some thought to what follows after the bill is enacted into law. While this day will go down in history as eventful as the day Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation over a hundred years ago, the days which immediately follow the signing of the bill by President Johnson will largely determine the success or failure of the law to serve its intended purpose.

The new law should not be used as an excuse for provoking civil disorders. If it is, we can except violence and bloodshed through racial clashes in the years ahead. So long as the Congress has not rectified the Declaration Proclamation over a hundred years ago, the days which immediately follow the signing of the bill by President Johnson will largely determine the success or failure of the law to serve its intended purpose.

The new law should not be used as an excuse for provoking civil disorders. If it is, we can expect violence and bloodshed through racial clashes in the years ahead. So long as the Congress has not rectified the promulgation of the bill by President Johnson will largely determine the success or failure of the law to serve its intended purpose.

The new law should not be used as an excuse for provoking civil disorders. If it is, we can expect violence and bloodshed through racial clashes in the years ahead. So long as the Congress has not rectified the promulgation of the bill by President Johnson will largely determine the success or failure of the law to serve its intended purpose.

Not so the defendant in a civil rights case, and unless you shall have labored in vain to bring about justice and equality through the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan. Mr. MEADER.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, with regret, I must cast my vote against the resolution to accept the Senate amendments and enact the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Senate amendments, in some respects, did improve the bill passed by the House on February 10, 1964, which I opposed. Those amendments, however, do not go far enough and do not cure the excessive power or the oppressive sanctions the House wrote into the bill. I voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1967, the first major legislation in this field in nearly 100 years, and favored the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, except to vote against the device for the assumption of State power through the appointment of referees by a Federal court.

My regret stems from my belief that the House bill was more drastic and should be within its constitutional powers to carry out our longstanding national policy that all citizens be treated alike. Congress should pass a fair, workable, effective civil rights law; but not one which extends the long arm of the Federal Government into every nook and cranny of our country: nor one which strips 190 million Americans of their sacred rights and protections written into our Constitution.

The Senate version of the bill did provide that the vast power vested in Federal officials with respect to public accommodations and equal employment should not be employed until remedies under State law were exhausted. The Senate version also provided for a jury trial of criminal contempt proceedings in Federal injunction suits except those relating to immunities.

The Senate version, however, did not limit the authority of the Federal Government to what I regard as its proper sphere of activity, actually increasing the power of the Attorney General and did not remove the obstructions of the legislative sanctions of the injunction process for enforcement of the act.

It should be emphasized that the jury trial provided by the Morton amendment relates only to criminal contempt after a judgment has been entered by the Federal judge, and does not provide a civil rights defendant with a jury trial on the merits of the case.

A thug, a narcotics peddler, an assassin, is entitled to, first, presumption of innocence; second, proof of guilt by admissible evidence beyond reasonable doubt; third, freedom to refuse to testify against himself; fourth, jury trial; fifth, a term when expires when penalty has been paid.

Not so the defendant in a civil rights case if H.R. 7152 becomes law.

Worse yet, his offenses of discrimination against him in the use of H.R. 7152, nor is it a term of art in legal terminology defined by court decisions.
A civil rights defendant, first, enjoys no presumption of innocence; second, proof, according to much less stringent rules of evidence, need be only by a preponderance of the evidence, and the defendant can be compelled to testify against himself under pain of being jailed for contempt of court; fourth, he is not entitled to a jury trial; fifth, the injunction against him hangs over his head for the rest of his life.

It was to protect individual citizens from abusive tyranny by its government and to avoid the evils and oppression practiced by the British monarchy, that our Founding Fathers established the first 10 amendments as protections to all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee which held hearings on this measure, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has absorbed the greatest part of my time and my efforts in this Congress. I sought in the subcommittee, and in the full Judiciary Committee, and in the full House of Representatives for those amendments as protections to all citizens.

The bill now before the House tempered to and softened by the final conference and the floor debate, is, in my judgment, a bill that will not adequately protect the rights of all citizens and that may, in fact, open the floodgates to abuse.

Mr. Speaker, much inaccurate information has been circulated about the legislation both as it left the House and as it is now before the Senate. Much inaccurate information has been circulated about the legislation both as it left the House and as it is now before the Senate. Much inaccurate information has been circulated about the legislation both as it left the House and as it is now before the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, who did not complain about his time allotment and I will not complain about his time allotment. I shall not complain about my 2 minutes. I shall also not apologize for having voted for the bill in the first place. But long debate and much publicity, the results of which are already beginning to show, have caused me to see this picture in a different light. Yes, I have changed my mind, but only in the best interest of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to again vote on the conscience in the cause of civil rights. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee will explain the major amendments adopted by the Senate. I approve them.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do is to guarantee to all Americans an equal chance to vote, to get an education and a job, and to be served in historically public places of accommodation. Important as the scope and extent of this bill is, it is also vitally important that all Americans understand what this bill does not cover.

Your mail and mine, your contacts and mine with our constituents, indicates a great degree of misunderstanding about this bill. People complain about racial “balancing” in the public schools, about open occupancy in housing, about preferences in hiring, and about mistreatment in the enforcement of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I yeld 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. Speaker, I yeld 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch).
Sixth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the operation of a farmer's farm.

Seventh. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to impose minority quotas, or the denial of a farmer's tenancy.

Eighth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with membership in farm organizations.

Ninth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to deny or interfere with an individual's right to requalifications.

Tenth. The bill neither authorizes nor permits the Federal Government to interfere in a State's right to fix voter qualifications.

Eleventh. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the private property rights of individual businessmen.

Mr. HALLUCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. HALLUCK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Ohio who is now speaking is one of the most able Members of the House of Representatives. He is one of the most dedicated, one of the most knowledgeable Members of the House in this particular instance. This bill has been the target of a tremendous misrepresentation as to what is contained in this bill and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could have order so that the gentleman's remarks may be heard.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at twelfth, the bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a lawyer, doctor, banker, or other professional man whom he must serve.

Thirteenth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government in any way to interfere with freedom of the press or freedom of speech.

Fourteenth. The bill contains no primary criminal penalties.

The bill does, however, seek to prohibit discrimination by every proper means, in accordance with the Constitution.

No statutory law will or can completely end the discrimination under attack by this legislation. Such discrimination will finally end only when the mind and heart and conscience of everyone of good will decrees it.

To create hope of immediate and complete success can only promote conflict, and result in brooding despair.

In the meantime I call upon—yes, I implore—leaders everywhere to shun violence of every kind, use our constitutional rights of freedom of speech and press, to peaceably assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, in the same manner by which we ourselves came a part of our great Constitution.

In the same vein, I suggest that those charged with the enforcement of the law proceed with all deliberate speed and consideration during the time of adjustment. And remember, the United States is under a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that all of us remain forever bound to another lost cause.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from New York (Mr. Celler) to close debate.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my fervent hope that all of the United States shall unite and follow with patience and with humane economy to achieve the objectives of this legislation. Let all of us of all regions, of all states, of all races move forward together to redeem the American pledge of equality of opportunity for all. No exhortation of mine should be necessary to bring this performance to a close. Further delay, I will say, would be fatal.

Cervantes once said, "By the street of by and by you reach the house of never." No bill has been left unexplored, undefined, unexplained. The amendments offered by the Senate are not at all. None of them do serious violence to the purpose of the bill. The choice between the Senate and the House is the choice of the American people.

The country desires no more argument, no more speeches; the country demands action now. Action is eloquence.

As to the Senate amendments, first, conviction of criminal contempt under all titles of the bill, except title I, with respect to voting rights, will require a jury trial. Jury trial is provided irrespective of the severity of the penalty imposed, but in no event may it exceed $1,000 fine or 6 months' imprisonment. No person can be convicted of criminal contempt unless the contempt is intentional. No person shall be placed in double jeopardy. The Senate amendment requires increased resort to State law and local machinery in the settlement of complaints involving racial discrimination in public accommodations or employment. Before the Attorney General may initiate an action under titles II or VII, he must have reasonable cause to believe that a pattern or practice of resistance to law exists. The Senate amendment to title IV, desegregation in public education, also provides for an increased resort to State and local machinery in the settlement of complaints respecting school desegregation.

The amendment further defines the intent of Congress with respect to the issue of racially balanced schools. Notice of the bill empowers Federal courts to issue any order which seeks to achieve, by using or other means, racial balance in the public schools.

The Senate amendment would assure that the phaseout of the Federal financial assistance under title VI is limited to the particular program or particular political entity in which discrimination existed and after a hearing.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would like to ask my chairman, what is the meaning of a 'pattern or practice' as it is used to limit the Attorney General's power to initiate suit under titles II and VII?

Mr. CELLER. A pattern or practice of resistance would exist, for example, where there is registration policy and system of registration in the State or local jurisdiction which results in denial of registration because of information or omission of voting applications in Federal elections. It creates a rebuttable presumption that a citizen who has completed a sixth-grade education is literate for voting purposes.

It further provides that where literacy tests are employed as a qualification for voting the tests must be conducted wholly in writing and certified copies maintained. It also authorizes the Attorney General or a defendant to request a three-judge court to hear and determine the case.

The amendment adds language which clarifies the criteria which the Attorney General will use in determining whether to initiate suits authorized by title III. The Senate amendment makes a provision which would permit the Attorney General to exempt from the literacy tests provisions of the Act which are not directly related to the practice of discrimination in voting registration and procedure.

Title II of the House bill provides that no citizen shall be subject to discrimination because of his race, color, religion, or national origin in certain places of public accommodation.

Title II of the House bill requires registration officials to apply uniform standards and procedures to prevent denial of registration because of material errors or omissions on voting applications in Federal elections. It creates a rebuttable presumption that a citizen who has completed a sixth-grade education is literate for voting purposes. It further provides that where literacy tests are employed as a qualification for voting the tests must be conducted wholly in writing and certified copies maintained.

It also authorizes the Attorney General or a defendant to request a three-judge court to hear and determine the case. It is particularly important to settle voting cases promptly because the right to vote is of little value after the election has been held.

The Senate amendment adds language which clarifies the criteria which the Attorney General will use in determining whether to initiate suits authorized by title III. The Senate amendment makes a provision which would permit the Attorney General to exempt from the literacy tests provisions of the Act which are not directly related to the practice of discrimination in voting registration and procedure.

Title II of the House bill provides that no citizen shall be subject to discrimina-
with those now in effect for other Federal administrative agencies.

**TITLE VI (NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS)**

**HOUSE**

Title VI of the House bill would permit the withholding of Federal funds from programs or parts of programs in which discrimination is practiced. This means that all Federal aid to a State or aid to a particular program will not be cut off because one particular part of the program or institution is being operated in violation of the law.

The Senate amendment adds a new section 604 which provides that nothing in this title authorizes Federal department or agency action with respect to employment practices except where a primary objective of Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

The Senate amendment adds a new section 605 which provides clarifying language.

**TITLE VII (EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY)**

**HOUSE**

Title VII of the House bill provides that certain employers, labor unions, and employment agencies whose actions affect interstate commerce are prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin against an individual seeking employment.

**SENATE**

The Senate amendment to title VII, like the amendment to title II, requires increased resort to State antidiscrimination agencies where they exist. This is consistent with the intent of the House bill.

The Senate amendment provides that a charge of an unfair employment practice must be filed by the person aggrieved or, by a member of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission which is established by this title. In the case of an alleged unlawful employment practice occurring in a State or local community which have laws prohibiting practices covered by what is provided in this bill, the person cannot file the charge with the Commission prior to 60 days after he has instituted proceedings under the State or local law, unless such action has been earlier terminated. The bill extends this period to 90 days during the first year after enactment of a comparable State or local law. Where a charge of an unfair practice is filed by a Commission member, the Commission shall notify the appropriate State or local agency and afford them the same period of time in which to resolve the complaint.

The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission is given a maximum of 60 days in which to obtain voluntary compliance with the provisions of the law.

If they are not able to do so, the aggrieved party in the case may file an action in the Federal district court in which the practice has occurred. If title II, the Senate amendment authorizes the court to accept the case without costs, furnish the complainant legal assistance, and permit the Attorney General to intervene in the action. The court may order such affirmative action as may be appropriate.

As a result of a pattern or practice of resistance to the law, the bill provides that the Attorney General may bring a civil action where he finds a pattern or practice of resistance to the law and may request a three-judge court to hear the case.

In addition, numerous revisions were made in the recordkeeping section of this title. The substitute language provides that where records on employment practices are required by State laws or Federal Executive orders, any additional information required by this law may be added to what is required to be kept.

The Senate amendment also—

First. Validates nondiscriminatory ability tests given by employers—section 703(j).

Second. Provides that compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended satisfies the requirement of the title barring discrimination because of sex—section 703(h).

Third. Deletes the provision exempting discrimination against atheists—section 705(b).

Fourth. Exempts corporations owned by Indian tribes—section 701(b).

Fifth. Subjects all employees of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission to the provisions of the Hatch Act—section 705(j).

Sixth. Exempts educational institutions with respect to employment connected with their educational activities—section 704.

**TITLE VIII (REGISTRATION FOR VOTING STATISTICS)**

**HOUSE**

Title VIII of the House bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a survey of registration and voting statistics in geographical areas recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. A Census Bureau survey would include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, plus statistics on the extent to which persons are registered to vote and have voted for Members of the House of Representatives since January 1960.

**SENATE**

The Senate amendment adds language to preserve the privacy of census information and provides penalties for disclosure violations. It provides that persons who do not wish to disclose their race, color, national origin, political preference, or voting preference are not required to do so, and must be fully informed of their right to refuse to answer such questions.

**TITLE IX**

**HOUSE**

Title IX in the House bill provides the right of appeal from a remand of a civil rights case from a State court from which it was removed.

**SENATE**

The Senate amendment adds a section 902, which was formerly written as section 902 in title III.

**TITLE X (COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE)**

**HOUSE**

The House bill establishes a Community Relations Service to assist State and local communities in the solution of racial problems arising out of discriminatory practices. The objective of this agency would be to secure voluntary compliance with the law through conciliation and mediation of these disputes.

**SENATE**

The Senate amendment deletes the limitation on the number of personnel to be appointed which was fixed in the House version, not to exceed six in number. Other Senate amendments are of a clarifying nature.

**TITLE XI (MISCELLANEOUS)**

**HOUSE**

Title XI of the House bill contains sections on separability, appropriations authority, and antipreemption provisions.

The Senate amendment adds two new sections.

New section 1101 provides for jury trial in all cases of criminal contempt arising under the bill, except voting rights cases under title I. It further provides that to be punishable as a criminal contempt the disobedience must be intentional. Criminal contempt proceedings under title I would remain subject to the provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

New section 1102 guarantees that no person will be placed in double jeopardy by virtue of criminal contempt proceedings and criminal prosecution being undertaken against him for the same act.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have an overwhelming vote for this bill; that that vote will reverberate throughout the land. I do not think that it can be said that Congress hearkens unto the voice of Leviticus, "proclaiming liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are others who have been paid deserved tributes for their great efforts in this very noble endeavor. I think all of us in this House, all of us who have labored on this great issue will recognize that there is one individual who has given such great dedication to this great cause, who has been so painstaking that he needed the patience of Job and who brought us to this fine hour when we now pass legislation which all of us feel is so right and so dear to the interest of this great country. I refer to the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, the great chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to whom this great tribute should be paid.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.
The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] has expired. All else has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.
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the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

**AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

**AUTHORIZING CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR AND CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1964**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar and consideration of motions to suspend the rules, in order on Monday, July 20, 1964, may be in order on Tuesday, July 21, 1964.

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

There was no objection.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the Congressional Record on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of the House.

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

There was no objection.

**MERCHANT MARINE ACT**

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 323, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 323
Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10650) to the second section of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the President shall be, and the Clerk of the House shall be, deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1183 (b)), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1964," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1965."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES**

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 795, Rept. No. 1359), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 795
Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1965, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such offices.

2. The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1964 for the election of Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated or elected.

3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1964 for the election of Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated or elected.

4. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee, political action committee, labor union, partnership, corporation, or individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:


(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the Congress or of the General Assembly of the United States.

(2) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, or received, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall have the power to investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint, are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be printed.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-eighth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such corroboration, books, records, papers, correspondence, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpoenas may be issued in the name of the Speaker, or of any member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(3) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the Congress or of the General Assembly of the United States.

(4) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the Congress or of the General Assembly of the United States.

(5) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the Congress or of the General Assembly of the United States.

(6) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the Congress or of the General Assembly of the United States.
Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration of House Resolution 75, to which I have cleared with the minority side.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk reads the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will consider the resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Sr. Grososz].

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us simply authorizes the Speaker of the House to appoint a select committee to investigate where necessary and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the office of Representative in Congress. This is customarily known as the Davis resolution in honor of its author. It was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] who for several years past has headed this committee in each election year, and who has by common agreement, so to speak, at what was at that time a very careful and outstanding job. I had the privilege of serving for a few years on the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration. In that capacity, I had the privilege and at times I might say the duty of looking into the work Mr. Davis' special committee had done in particular, it had investigated. I uniformly found that the quality of its work was high, and its approach thorough.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides that the special committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate the extent and nature of expenditures made by candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office, including the amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the purpose of this resolution, it is to give jurisdiction to a select committee to investigate expenditures and so forth in regard to the nomination and election of Members of Congress.

Does it mean when the word "nomination" is used that the Federal Government is assuming investigative jurisdiction over primary elections?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Tennessee, the author of the resolution, were here to answer the gentleman's question. However, it has been my understanding throughout all the years that the committee has not had this jurisdiction, or if it did have that jurisdiction it did not exercise it.

Now, as I understand it, this committee has been created each 2 years for approximately the past 20 years. If the committee has had such jurisdiction, I am told by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that it has never exercised it with respect to primaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, can he give me the assurance that this resolution does not give this committee the right to invade the province of the several States with regard to primary elections?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. BURLESON. Well, as I understand the functioning of this committee, as it has functioned in the past, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi, under the prevailing law, which we assume will be the law in the next few hours, I would say to the gentleman that this committee could exercise its jurisdiction over every primary campaign in every place where one is held.

Mr. Speaker, heretofore it has only assumed the responsibility of inquiring into irregularities, but not the conduct of the primary election as such. However, under the various laws of the various States, and particularly the Federal Practices Act, for instance, that provides a limitation upon the amount of money that a candidate can spend in seeking a primary. The gentleman from Mississippi is assuming investigative capacity, I had the privilege and at times I might say the duty of looking into the work. I had the privilege of serving for a few years on the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration. But I repeat under the present law I believe that the committee could do just about what it wanted to do in this instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in the State of Mississippi we have a Corrupt Practices Act, for instance, that provides a limitation upon the amount of money that a candidate can spend in seeking election in a Democratic or Republican primary. Would this committee be given the authority to go behind the laws of the State of Mississippi and determine whether they have been obeyed? In other words, is this an attempt to preempt State laws in regard to primary elections?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think I can reasonably assume that the gentleman from Mississippi that it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would hope that the Federal Government is not going to extend its long arm further into the jurisdictions that belong exclusively to the several States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I join the gentleman in the expression of that wish.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. I may say to the gentleman that I have had the privilege of serving on this committee, if it can be considered as a privilege in that it most certainly is not. I assume we are investigating expenditures and holds hearings. This has occurred on two occasions I know of as a participating member and I may say to the gentleman as a matter of fact to my knowledge on those two occasions relating to the last two sessions of Congress and the last two elections the committee has not seen fit to go into the question of nominations but, rather, only the last two sessions of Congress. That has been the practice of the committee in the past, and I assume it will be the practice in the future.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been cleared with the minority. There was no objection to it, as far as I know, in the Rules Committee. However, there seems to be a certain amount of discrepancy in that statement now. Several Members on the floor of the House would like to express themselves on that. So I would like to yield more time to the gentleman from Florida, who is thoroughly familiar with this matter.

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder why we must have this select committee, this House Administration Committee that is empowered to go into elections? Why is this necessary?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will say to the gentleman that the select committee has been functioning now for at least 6 or 8 years, to my knowledge. It is nothing new.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the procedure of this committee, as I am sure the gentleman knows, is to investigate charges brought by the recommendation of the Committee.

The committee to which the gentleman refers is out of business after the adjournment of Congress. So it is obvious some action has to be taken in the form of a select committee to sit during the adjournment of the Congress. The purpose of this is to give the select committee the opportunity to hold hearings, and use subpoena powers, and thus fully investigate the matters and report to the very committee the gentleman refers to.

The subcommittee of the select committee makes a report to the full committee. Then, of course, that recommendation is acted upon by the committee the gentleman mentions.

Mr. GROSS. What is the budget, or is there a budget in connection with the operation of this committee?

Mr. CRAMER. It is very nominal. As I recall, it is approximately $30,000.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. And the money is turned back by the select committee if it is not used up in full.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. There are two questions involved in this issue. This committee has been authorized to act both before and after the fact, in alleged violations in any election. It deals with the conduct of candidates and their representatives in the conduct of campaigns. It should be borne in mind this is a campaign season. It does not take any legislative action.
It recommends to the Committee on House Administration. The Committee on House Administration only assumes responsibility for the facts that there are alleged violations and a contest is filed. That is the distinction.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Another reason is these matters should be from the investigative standpoint, at least preliminarily disposed of in a recommendation before the Congress convenes, so that Members being seated will not be questioned as to their right to be seated. More than that, there may be a violation of the law under the guise of protecting civil rights, and certainly the judicial branch, and certainly the Judicial Branch may assume in connection with local affairs, it can do so to a degree heretofore imagined. That is my opinion.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas. If this applies only to the general election, why not get it through now? Why do we proceed as we have in the past and pass this as one of the resolutions before we adjourn? Why all the hurry now?

Mr. BURLESON. I am not too sure why we are proceeding before the next session commences. This was this yesterday, but from now on until November we are going to have primaries and conventions. This is not limited to the general election in November.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is different from what we hear so far as the Rules Committee is concerned. They assured us it is not to go into the primaries. We have already had our primaries in California.

Mr. BURLESON. As stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elrod] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], this is not a new law on the books. It has been in the statute book for a long time. I have been on the other side defending the creation of this committee a few years ago. I think it was to do the thing the gentleman from Iowa mentioned a while ago, to appoint a special committee.

But it would take an expansion of the work of the committee, that is if we did the things that have always been done heretofore—that we have a collection of the evidence of any violation in any election whether it be the primary or whether it be as to the election machinery or even by convention, I would assume, or whether it be with respect to the November election. This committee by its very nature is continuing through the recess of the Congress, assuming that we have one, and they accumulate such facts under allegations which may be made by any candidate or the representatives of any candidates. They submit that after the November election the House Committee on Administration would have a further investigation if it deems it proper to do so and try it and justified and so forth.

Now back to the gentleman’s question as to whether it is necessary and why it is necessary. I say it was not necessary and that the presently constituted machinery of the committees could take care of it. I am not too sure, but I have thought at the time that it was worth trying.

But this committee is empowered with a great deal more authority under this resolution than the presently constituted committees are. Because, as I said, it is an after-the-fact thing—a fait accompli so far as the House Committee on House Administration is concerned. Only in cases where elections are contested for a seat in the Senate or a seat in the House of Representatives. So this committee does have a special function.

There is always the question as to where the authority of this committee or any other committee stops, or when it should begin, in deference to State and local authority in these matters. That is the question, and as I said a little bit ago, I did not intend to inject this question, because it is just speculation at this point. But at the same time I say that with the trend of events as of today, it would appear that the Federal Government is becoming all encompassing in all these matters anyway.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman answer this question? Then is it your idea that we are hurrying to pass a resolution which normally comes a week or 2 weeks before the session is adjourned? Is that necessitated by the bill we just passed?

Mr. BURLESON. No, I would not think that really has anything to do with it. I think if it is going to be done, it had better be done at this point rather than wait another session and we are closer to the elections. If there are violations and if accusations are made of irregularities, a record is made, a file established to present to the Elections Committee of the House Administration Committee. Evidence so collected becomes a part of any contested election subsequently filed.

Actually this select committee is in the position of policing elections and it certainly includes primaries. It submits its findings with or without recommendations. That is really its mission and its function.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would prefer to give this authority to this committee than for the Civil Rights Commission to exercise its powers over the same matter. I have my doubts that the creation of this committee is necessary and about 8 or 10 years ago proposed it, not be done but my views did not prevail. I repeat, if this function must be performed I would rather see this committee do it.

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

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why, if this committee is empowered to go into primary elections, the committee was not constituted at the beginning of this session of Congress and before many of the primary elections were held. If it is empowered to go into primaries, why is it not established several months ago? It is not sufficient to try to justify this resolution simply on the grounds that it has been approved in the past.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am sorry I was momentarily off the floor, but I was called away.

This committee or rather the authority for the existence of this committee, goes back to about 30 or 40 years ago. About this time last year, the Speaker of the House, whoever he may be, is the occupant of the Chair.

This committee is not an investigative committee. But it was suggested first by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. Some of you are not familiar with some of these names, but the late Percy Priest was chairman of the committee on one occasion. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Runt Bishop, was chairman of the committee as it was constituted and authorized.
The late Congressman Mansfield from Texas was chairman, and there were a number of others whose names do not immediately come to my mind.

It so happens that I have been named as chairman of the last four committees. The committee has the approval of the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable Charles Hallock, the minority leader, and has the approval of the majority leader, and the Speaker has always considered it of importance, because we must police the Corrupt Practices Act and lawful contributions received by candidates and make certain that laws relating to labor-management contracts be complied with.

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

Mr. Davis of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Younger. I believe we understand the committee. I believe we understand what was done before.

We have never been required to file financial statements for primaries on a Federal basis. We are required to file them in the State.

This committee has usually been appointed near the end of the session each time, rather than in the middle of the session. We in California have already held our primary. We have not filed statements. We have not been required to file statements.

Is the committee going back into the primaries?

Mr. Davis of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. Younger. That is what we are trying to find out.

Mr. Haley. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New York yield to me?

Mrs. St. George. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Haley. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the committee at this particular time wants to look into any primary which has been held?

Mr. Davis of Tennessee. Not a single one.

Mr. Haley. Would the gentleman answer another question?

In previous resolutions of this kind the words "nomination and" been included? I asked the gentleman from Alabama, and he was not sure.

As I see it, the resolution would give authority never granted before. If you have had it, you have not exercised it.

The Speaker would be told to look into primary nominations of various parties. I do not believe that is any place the Federal Government should be.

Would the gentleman consider accepting an amendment to cut out the words "nomination and" leave the word "election"? In other words, what I am trying to say is, would the gentleman consider an amendment that would merely grant the right to inquire into general elections rather than primaries, where men are nominated?

Mr. Davis of Tennessee. Why, certainly. I have no objection. I say "I," because it so happens that I have been the chairman for the past 8 years, four times in a row.

The language of this resolution is the same language that has been in the resolution for the past 30 years. We have never gone into primary elections, and we do not intend to now, whoever may be the chairman of the committee. If it will make the gentleman feel easier, certainly I will accept an amendment to strike out the words he mentions.

Mr. Haley. I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that everybody here knows he has had this responsibility for some time. He has been fair and impartial. Now we are also confronted with a slightly different situation, I say to the gentleman. So long as the gentleman from Tennessee is the chairman of that committee, I feel certain there would not be prying into primary elections or nominations by political parties, but we now have a little different situation. I believe that if the words "nomination and" were stricken from this resolution I could support it.

The Speaker. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker declared that the "aye" appeared to have it.

Mr. Williams. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition of an amendment.

The Speaker. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for the purpose of an amendment?

Mr. Elliott. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

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

Mrs. St. George. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor.

The Speaker. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of order temporarily?

Mr. Williams. I withdraw it temporarily.

Will the gentlewoman yield to me for that purpose?

The Speaker. For what purpose?

Mr. Williams. For the purpose of offering an amendment or several amendments.

Mrs. St. George. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, because I am only working on the rule, as I understand it. We have to wait.

Mr. Gross. Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be further debate, then I think there ought to be some people to hear it. Therefore, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The Speaker. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. Elliott. 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. 180]

- Abbott, Bennett, Mich. Digs
- Ashley, Berry, N.Y.
- Aucinhios, Brown, N.J.
- Baker, Colmer, Ill.
- Bass, Davis, Ga.
- Becker, Derouman, Ky.
- Kilburn, Miller, N.Y.
- King, Calif.
- King, Wash.
- Lankester, N.J.
- Lesinski, Ill.
- Lauson, Miss.
- McFaul, Patman, Texas
- McMillan, Picher, Okla.
- Martin, N.M.
- Moon, Rogers, Tex.
- St. Geoge, Mass.
- Baker, Kans.
- Smith, Cal.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Utz, Md.
- Walston, Wash.
- Williams, Tex.
- Wydler, N.J.

The Speaker. On this rollcall, 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. St. George. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I think there has been considerable confusion. I know there has been in my mind and I think there is in the minds of many of the Members, since this resolution came out of the Rules Committee.

We were informed at the time that this was the resolution that had been passed every 2 years for a long period of time, and the author of the resolution stated since that time.

The next question that came up on the floor, and I think it is of the greatest importance, is why this great hurry to get this resolution through now? Why not wait until the House is in session?

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

Mrs. St. George. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor.

The Speaker. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of order temporarily?

Mr. Williams. I withdraw it temporarily.

Will the gentlewoman yield to me for that purpose?

The Speaker. For what purpose?

Mr. Williams. For the purpose of offering an amendment or several amendments.

Mrs. St. George. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, because I am only working on the rule, as I understand it. We have to wait.

Mr. Gross. Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be further debate, then I think there ought to be some people to hear it. Therefore, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The Speaker. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. Elliott. 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. 180]

- Abbitt, Bennet, Mich. Digs
- Ashley, Berry, N.Y.
- Aucinhios, Brown, N.J.
- Baker, Colmer, Ill.
- Bass, Davis, Ga.
- Becker, Derouman, Ky.
- Kilburn, Miller, N.Y.
- King, Calif.
- King, Wash.
- Lankester, N.J.
- Lesinski, Ill.
- Lauson, Miss.
- McFaul, Patman, Texas
- McMillan, Picher, Okla.
- Martin, N.M.
- Moon, Rogers, Tex.
- St. Geoge, Mass.
- Baker, Kans.
- Smith, Cal.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Utz, Md.
- Walston, Wash.
- Williams, Tex.
- Wydler, N.J.
Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

On July 2, 1960, exactly 4 years ago today, July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of the House of Representatives, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

On July 2, 1960, exactly 4 years ago today, July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of the House of Representatives, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of this House, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.
mittee was instituted and was suggested by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, who at that time was serving as majority leader. I am sure of the facts that far back. I think it is my recollection that this committee has been approved unanimously every 2 years in the exact language in which it has been brought to the House today.

I would remind the House that one of the early chairmen of this committee was the present distinguished occupant of the Chair, Speaker McCormack. The late Percy Priest was chairman one time. My good friend, the former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], when he was presiding as Speaker, as you will recall, appointed the distinguished gentleman, Mr. "Runt" Bishop, of Illinois, as Chairman. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], has been chairman. I have been appointed three times by the late Speaker Rayburn and once by Speaker McCormack to head this committee.

And so forth.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the Members to vote to this resolution so that the committee in its time may go to work but in advance that the competent staff may advise the candidates for this office of their rights under the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I re­quest that I not support House Resolution 795. My objection to the resolution is that the inquiry this time. I feel Members should have it pointed out—although I have gone so far as to require a com­mittee under oath, by any person, candi­date, or political committee, setting forth al­legations as to facts which, under this reso­lution, it would be the duty of said commit­tee to investigate.

And so forth.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I request that I not support House Resolution 795. My objection to the resolution primarily springs from a conviction that the supervision of primaries in which candidates are nominated should be reserved to the States. This resolution would appear to transfer that authority to the Congress.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I request that I not support House Resolution 795. My objection to the resolution primarily springs from a conviction that the supervision of primaries in which candidates are nominated should be reserved to the States. This resolution would appear to transfer that authority to the Congress.

My more serious objection, however, is to the provisions of subsection (8) There is provided that the committee created by this resolution shall report promptly to the Attorney General of the United States all violations of any Federal or State statutes in order that the Court may take such official action as may be proper.

This is a clear case of preemption of jurisdiction by the Federal Government. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years I am convinced that it would construe this language to deprive States of authority to prosecute violators of State election laws in cases where the election of Members of the House of Representatives is involved. This is not a desirable re­sult. I suspect that even the propo­nents of the resolution would agree with this premise.

I would hope that in the future when such resolutions are drafted the propo­nents would engraft upon them a savings clause preserving to the States unques­tioned authority to enforce the criminal laws of the States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "aye" ap­peared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 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—yens 264, nays 92, not voting 76, as follows:

YEAS—264

Byrnes, Wis.    Hooven, N.Y.
Cahall    Holifield, Ga.
Cameron    Horan, P.E.
Carey    Ickes, N.Y.
Cederberg    Hutchinson, N.C.
Chief    Ichord, Okla.
Cobb    Johnson, Tex.
Cohan    Johnston, Calif.
Collier    Jordan, Utah
Comte    Johnstone, Va.
Corbett    Jones, Ala.
Crane    Kefauver, Tenn.
Cramer    Kendall, Kan.
Curtin    Kennedy, Mass.
Dagge    Kilkore, N.C.
Daniel    King, Calif.
Davis    King, N.C.
Dawson    King, Tenn.
Deaver    Kluczynski, Wis.
Derwinski    Kolbe, Wis.
Devine    Kongrey, Iowa
Roberts, Tex.
Roberts, Utah    Longstreet, Miss.
Howard    Louisiana
Howard, La.    Lufkin, Tex.
Howard, Me.    Lynch, Texas
Howard, S.C.    Lugar, Ind.
Howard, Va.    Lusk, Okla.
Hoskins    Mackay, Calif.
Hudson    Mackenzie, Idaho
Hunt    Mackinlay, Nebr.
Hunt, Ala.    Madsen, Calif.
Hunt, Ind.    Mahaffey, Ala.
Hunt, Ohio    Mahrr, Tenn.
Hunt, Texas    Males, N.Y.
Hunt, Wash.    Maloney, N.Y.
Hurst    Mason, La.
Hutchinson    Mathias, Ill.
Hutson    Mathias, Ind.
Ike    McClellan, N.Y.
Ichord    McCoque, Fla.
Ickes    McDowell, Ky.
Ickes    McEachron, Tex.
Icard    McKinley, W.Va.
International    McMillan, Cali.
Investigation    McGann, N.Y.
Jackson    McInerny, Iowa
Jennings    McGovern, Iowa
Jennings, Mo.    McGeough, Tenn.
Johnson    McGeough, Texas
Jones, N.Y.    Meehan, Mass.
Jones, S.C.    Meek, Ariz.
Jones, Wash.    Meek, Calif.
Joyce    Meineke, Neb.
Judson    Menendez, Fla.
Kalamazoo    Merriam, N.Y.
Kan    Merrill, Iowa
Kane    Merriam, Mass.
Kaplan    Merriam, N.H.
Kaufman    Mervin, Ill.
Kaufman    Miller, Calif.
Kaufman, Va.    Miller, Iowa
Kaufman, Wisc.    Miller, Ohio
Kaufman, Wyo.    Miller, Tenn.
Kaye    Miller, Wis.
Kay    Miller, Wisc.
Kay, Ind.    Miller, Wis.
Kelley    Miller, Wisc.
Kelley, Iowa    Miller, Wisc.
Kelley, N.Y.    Milligan, Ark.
Kelly    Milligan, E.
Kelly, Ala.    Milligan, Fla.
Kelly, Ind.    Milligan, Ky.
Kelly, Ky.    Milligan, Ky.
Kelly, Miss.    Milligan, Ky.
Kennedy    Milligan, Ky.
Kennedy    Milledge, Okla.
Kerr    Miles, Tex.
Kerr, Md.    Mills, N.J.
Kerr, Wis.    Mills, N.Y.
Key    Mills, Wisc.
Kean    Mills, Wisc.
Kearney    Misg, Wisc.
Keith    Morris, Calif.
Keith    Morris, Ohio
Keller    Morris, Wisc.
Keller, N.J.    Morse, Mich.
Keller, Tex.    Morse, Wisc.
Keller, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, N.Y.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, N.Y.    Morse, N.Y.
Kemp, Wash.    Morse, Wash.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
Kemp, Wisc.    Morse, Wisc.
may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 795 just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TO INCORPORATE THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8560) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Kercher" and insert "Kercher".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "A. M. Pride, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Truner" and insert "Truner."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Mills, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4655) to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—dealing with unrelated business taxable income—with a Senate amendment there-to, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1962" and insert "1963."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. Cooley. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight July 9 to file a report on the bill H.R. 1161, a matter which has been cleared with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Baucus], who is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. Aspinall. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on the bill S. 2 (to establish a National water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research), and as unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1526)

The committee of conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, have agreed to amend and do recommend to their respective Houses the following:

That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Research Act of 1964."

(b) In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, it is the purpose of the Congress, by this Act, to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the field of water resources which affect water.

"TITLE I—STATE WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES"

"Sec. 100. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums adequate to provide $75,000 to each of the several States in the amount of $75,000 in each of the second and third years, and $100,000 each year thereafter to assist each participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a
competent and qualified water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency (hereinafter referred to as "institute") at one college or university in each State, or at one or more separate colleges or universities established in accordance with the Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 500), which have a sufficient supply of water; methods of increasing such supplies of water; conservation and best use of available supplies of water; methods of increasing such supplies; and economic, legal, social, engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of water problems, having due regard to the varying conditions of the States and the regions concerned.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such institute, whether a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated, to conduct competent research, investigations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to water resources and to provide for the training of scientists through such research, investigations, and experiments. Such research, investigations, and experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, aspects of the water situation in the various States of the United States, including, but not limited to, the nature of the water, water sources, and water quality, and the relationship of other known sources to the meeting of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken, including the development and coordination of regional water resources research projects by two or more institutes.

"(c) Each application for a grant pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each of the succeeding years, 1966, $1,000,000; 1967, $2,000,000; 1968, $3,000,000; 1969, $4,000,000; and 1969, and each of the succeeding years, $5,000,000. Such moneys when appropriated, shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and for the fiscal year or years immediately following, unless disapproved by the Congress within 60 calendar days after receipt by the President or by the Senate if the Senate is in session when the Congress is in adjournment for more than three calendar days, or by the House if the House is in session when the Senate is in adjournment for more than three calendar days. Any moneys not disapproved shall be available for the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and for the fiscal year or years immediately following.

"(d) Each application for a grant pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by March 1, 1965, and each of the succeeding years, or such later date as the Secretary may approve. Each application shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit each proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate for its approval, which approval shall not be withheld unless the Committee disapproves the same.

"(e) If the moneys received by the authorized receiving officer of any institute under the provisions of this Act have, or may reasonably be expected to be available for printing and publishing the results thereof, or for administrative planning and direct educational purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act, and, if the sums available to all of the cooperating States, as prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior under this Act, shall be the funds have, or may reasonably be expected to be available to any of the colleges or universities, shall be applied or paid to any institute of such State.

"(f) Moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, in addition to being available for expenses for research, investigations, experiments, and training conducted under authority of this Act, shall be available for printing and publishing the results thereof, and for administrative planning and direct educational purposes, and encouraged to plan and conduct programs financed under this Act in cooperation with each other and with such other general agencies of the Federal Government as those of the United States may contribute to the solution of the water problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

"(g) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act, and, if the sums available to all of the cooperating States, as prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior under this Act, shall be the funds have, or may reasonably be expected to be available for the capability of doing effective work. He shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, participate in coordinating research initiated under this Act by the institutes, indicate to them such lines of research, and encourage, and support, such research as he may deem most important, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of relationships between the institutes and between them and other research organizations, the United States Department of the Interior, and other Federal establishments.

"(h) "On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the institutes in all States for the fiscal year. The report shall indicate whether any portion of the appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefore.

"SEC. 105. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the colleges or universities, or any institute established in accordance with the Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 500), and the State in which it is located, and nothing in this Act shall in any way be construed to affect the proper administration of education at any college or university.
conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Secretary may determine after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Any information contained in this subsection shall not deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any right which such owner may have under that patent.

"Sec. 304. There shall be established, in such agency and location as the President determines to be desirable, a center for cataloging current and projected scientific research and investigation projects in progress or scheduled by all Federal agencies and Federal agency doing water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, to make such information available.

There shall be established, in the Department of the Interior, a water resources research institute in each State, with such institute designated by the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, may make the designation as to location of the institute at the land grant college or some other institution designated by act of the State legislature. Where there are two land grant colleges in one State the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, may make the designation as between the two campuses.

ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Senate-passed bill included, under title II, additional water resources research programs to be established through grants of up to $4 million in the first year increasing to $10 million in the 5th year and thereafter. These funds would be available to the Secretary to make grants, contracts, matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions with private firms and individuals, and with local, State, or Federal government agencies, to undertake research into any aspect of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior. The House amendment deletes this title entirely. The conference committee agreed to retain the language of the Senate amendment, with the proviso that any proposed grant, contract or other arrangement financed under this title must be submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate and the House amendment, and funds will not be appropriated for implementation thereof until 60 calendar days after such submission, and then only if, within said period, neither committee disapproves.
The conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Anichinco.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Finnegann with Mr. Sibal.

The House language provided for establishing water resources research institutes at only one college or university in each State, with such institute to be established at the land-grant college unless otherwise provided by act of the State legislature. The committee on conference agreed with the House language limiting the number of institutions to not more than one in each State, but the language permitting the State legislature to designate some other institution in lieu of the land-grant college was changed somewhat to make it a little easier for the State legislature to act, and in this it should be allowed to do so. Under the language agreed upon the land-grant college would still be designated automatically unless the State legislature acted to designate some other institution. Therefore, there are two land-grant colleges in one State, the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, could make the designation as between the two.

The House-approved language relates to the additional water resources research programs that would have been authorized under title II in the Senate-passed bill. In the Senate-passed bill these programs involve the appropriation of $5 million in the first year, increasing to $10 million in the sixth year and thereafter. The House-approved language deleted this title entirely.

The conference report agreed to retain the additional water resources research programs described in title II of the Senate-passed bill but to limit the amounts authorized to be appropriated to $1 million in the first year, increasing to $5 million in the sixth year and thereafter, with the further provision that any proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement under the authority contained in this title would have to be approved by the Congress for a 60-day review period and funds could be appropriated for implementation only if, during this review period, neither of the legislative committees disapproved.

The House-approved language relates to patents in connection with the research work authorized. The committee on conference accepted the Senate language providing that no part of the funds made available may be expended for research work unless the expenditures were conditioned upon provisions which insure that all information, devices, and processes resulting from the research work would thereafter be made fully and freely available to the public.

The committee on conference retained the language which the House added to the Senate-passed bill directing the establishment of some effective means for
clarifying Federal agency responsibilities in water resources research and providing effective interagency coordination of such research. This provision in the House bill which goes to all water resources research within the Federal establishment was considered by our committee as one of the most important problems we faced. It is our hope that it will result in substantial savings and will eliminate duplication of research effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the record be extended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to the House my satisfaction with S. 2 as it has emerged from the conference committee. The reasonableness with which the conferees have fulfilled their task and resolved the differences between the House and Senate versions of this bill is apparent in the results.

I am particularly pleased with two features of the bill. First, in restoring a part of the Senate title II . Appropriations will not be made for any grant or contract under this title until the proposal has laid before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate for 60 days, and either of these Committees may disapprove the proposal if it finds reason to do so.

The second is the retention of the House-sponsored language relating to coordination of water resource research activities of the Federal agencies. We have altogether too many downtown agencies operating independently in this field. We want results and we need results from water research but we do not want a separate Federal agency for every one of these agencies—the Public Health Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, the Forest Service, the Weather Bureau, the National Science Foundation, and a whole host of others—to outdo each other. We need to cover the whole field, to do so in a planful and systematic way, and to be sure that nothing is left undone in the program and nothing done that ought not to be done. Above all we do not want wasteful duplication. Here is the nub of the problem. Section 305, I am glad to say, gives the President a tool to enforce order among the agencies. It gives him a power that must be used wisely and forcefully. If this is done, the benefits that will flow to the American people from S. 2 will be immeasurable and the pattern that is here set up for water research will be followed in other fields where similar problems exist.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the record be extended.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the conference report regarding S. 2. The conferences have worked hard on this matter, and I believe we have come up with what is the best we could hope for under the circumstances. When this bill was originally discussed in the House, I objected because the language was so strict that it made it mandatory that a water resources project automatically be designated for a land-grant college. This would have practically eliminated the possibility of the University of Texas, which has an excellent water resources project, to have participated in these grants. This conference report does soften that language some and makes these grants available to "land-grant schools or some other institution dealing with, water resources development and research" also provides that one school can cooperate with another school in the same State to carry out the purposes of the act.

Title II has been inserted in this bill and this provides at least $1 million per year for a total of 9 years wherein educational institutions—other than those establishing institutions under title I of this act—can undertake research and development to adhere to the Statement of Policy and other research organizations.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to the House my satisfaction with S. 2 as it has been developed by the conferees, contains the original Senate language with regard to patents.

You will recall that in passing the bill, the House amended S. 2 to delete this language and insert a provision calling for those administering research and development to adhere to the Statement of Policy and other research organizations.

The controversy over the disposition of inventions made in the performance of Government-financed research is not a new one, and, in fact, has grown over the years as the Government has become involved in more and more technical effort. As recently as 2 years ago, when industry and Government were poles apart on their views, substantial progress has been made through the normal, although admittedly slow, legislative process, aided by changes in Administration positions.

Largely through comprehensive hearings held by the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions, which I had the honor to chair, on legislation introduced in the 85th Congress, in the 1958 Space Act, and hearings on Government-wide patent policy before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, there evolved a reasonable understanding of the equities involved in Government research and development contracting with private industry, universities, and other research organizations.

One point on which there was general agreement is that Government patent policy must assure the Government of fulfilling objectives of its technical efforts, whether these be a new missile system, a large booster capability for launching satellites, or any of the other technical advances that Grow the nation, such as water purification, or methods of purifying the air we breathe, to mention but a few. In order that these, and other research and development objectives, may be established quickly and at reasonable cost, the Government must be in a position to attract the best technical competence available, whether it be a private industry or the university. We must take into consideration the experience, background, knowledge, and technical capability required for the solution of highly complex technical problems.

It is generally recognized that patent ownership is a very complex subject and one that does not lend itself to an easy solution. The varying equities involved in government-industry relationships require a great deal of flexibility and at times detailed negotiation.

Recognizing all these factors and being fully aware that a legislative solution to the overall problem of Government patent policy would be a long time developing, the President issued a statement of policy for the guidance of agencies not covered by law. The statement of policy was developed with the advice of his Science Adviser, and with the cooperation of all Federal departments and agencies. I have spoken on this policy on several occasions in the past—to command the President for issuing it and when the House rejected restrictive patent language in the Clean Air Act.

The President did not intend that the statement of policy would provide the final solution but rather that it be a statement of policy which would be developed to meet the changing conditions of the future. Appropriate provisions in the law are necessary to make the statement of policy a living one that does not lend itself to an easy solution. The varying equities involved in government-industry relationships requires a great deal of flexibility and at times detailed negotiation.

Recognizing all these factors and being fully aware that a legislative solution to the overall problem of Government patent policy would be a long time developing, the President issued a statement of policy for the guidance of agencies not covered by law. The statement of policy was developed with the advice of his Science Adviser, and with the cooperation of all Federal departments and agencies. I have spoken on this policy on several occasions in the past—to command the President for issuing it and when the House rejected restrictive patent language in the Clean Air Act.

The President did not intend that the statement of policy would provide the final solution but rather that it be a statement of policy which would be developed to meet the changing conditions of the future. Appropriate provisions in the law are necessary to make the statement of policy a living one that does not lend itself to an easy solution. The varying equities involved in government-industry relationships require a great deal of flexibility and at times detailed negotiation.

Recognizing that a legislative solution to the overall problem of Government patent policy would be a long time developing, the President issued a statement of policy for the guidance of agencies not covered by law. The statement of policy was developed with the advice of his Science Adviser, and with the cooperation of all Federal departments and agencies. I have spoken on this policy on several occasions in the past—to command the President for issuing it and when the House rejected restrictive patent language in the Clean Air Act.

The President did not intend that the statement of policy would provide the final solution but rather that it be a statement of policy which would be developed to meet the changing conditions of the future. Appropriate provisions in the law are necessary to make the statement of policy a living one that does not lend itself to an easy solution. The varying equities involved in government-industry relationships require a great deal of flexibility and at times detailed negotiation.
It is my sincere conviction that progress in the development of reasonable and equitable Government patent policy will be retarded by the continued adoption of restrictive and discriminatory provisions such as contained in S. 2. This language is at best ambiguous. Legal authorities have argued since its first adoption in the Heilman and Coal Research Acts that they could not understand what "fully and freely available to the general public" meant. The Department of Interior has interpreted this to mean outright Government ownership of all inventions, regardless of the equities involved or the amount of public as contrasted with private, investment involved. Moreover, it has been brought to my attention on several occasions that this language has also been interpreted by the Interior Department as justification for demanding background patents—in spite of the fact that this is specifically prohibited.

Adoption of the Senate language will lead to delay in much-needed water research and development programs to the extent that thewhole Government program is directed at the Congress. There has been much experience under other research programs in agencies bound by restrictive patent provisions. An example is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, a Federal agency.

This was borne out in two separate reports by the Committee on Science and Astronautics in reporting legislation to amend the patent provisions of the Space Act. In 1960, H.R. 10260, based on the committee's recommendation, passed this legislation. The Senate failed to act.

Of even greater significance, this language is not in keeping with the President's policy. In a letter to the Chairman of the House and Senate Interior Committees, Mr. Phillip H. Hughes, assistant director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, stated:

As a follow-up, committees, the pertinent provisions of section 203 (section 603 of the bill) would inhibit the desirable flexibility of the administration's policy with respect to patent rights and we, therefore, recommend the deletion of those provisions from S. 2.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the conference report on S. 2 has been brought before the House, without opportunity to discuss the important patent provisions, is deplorable.

I do not want to belabor this point. I have stated my position on this matter as forcefully as possible under the circumstances and I hope that this will alert the Members of the House to the dangers of adopting the Senate patent language. This is contrary to the traditional position of the House which has either initiated provisions consistent with the administration's flexible position or has rejected title provisions inserted by the other body.

This will come when Congress will face up to its responsibilities and enact a governmentwide policy. Until this happens, I would urge that no further attempts be made to restrict Federal research programs and that we, to our knowledge, not support the President's efforts to arrive at a reasonable solution.
of legislation, some of which has been minor legislation and some of which has been rather far reaching. The particular bill which presently before the House, as I understand it, would merely grant a Federal charter to a group in Ohio; is that correct?

Mr. FORBES. That is correct. The purpose of setting up an air museum into which there will be no Federal money. Is that correct?

Mr. FORBES. Not only no Federal money but let me say it has already been passed by the House. This is simply to concur in a Senate amendment which simply changes the name of a person erroneously placed in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has previously explained the bill to me and I shall not object at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6455), to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—dealing with unrelated business taxable income—with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. A few moments ago I objected to the consideration of this bill in line with the statement that I just made. The bill has been explained to me as being one of an emergency nature. If it is not passed at this time I understand that damage may result. Therefore, I will withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills) may extend his remarks at this point in the Raceway.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, as passed unanimously by the House on April 14, 1964, H.R. 6455 provided for a tax on the unrelated business taxable income in the case of labor unions and agricultural or horticultural organizations where certain conditions are met. These conditions were that, first, the income must be used to establish, maintain, or operate a retirement home, hospital, or similar facility for the exclusive use of aged and infirm members of the labor union or agricultural or horticultural organization; second, the income must be derived from agricultural pursuits conducted on ground contiguous to the home, hospital, and so forth, and third, this income may not represent more than 75 percent of the cost of maintaining and operating the home, and so forth.

The bill was passed by the other body with one amendment only, relating to the effective date of the bill. Under the Senate amendment, the provisions of the bill would apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963, instead of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, as provided in the House-passed bill.

I urge that the House accept the amendment of the Senate.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. Rept. No. 1529)

The committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $655,525,600; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $4,341,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $563,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $5,246,293,250. As a result of the conference this figure was adjusted so that total appropriations authorized are $5,227,506,000.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are conforming amendments resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 3: NASA requested a total of $26 million to fund its advanced missions program which is designed to plan an extension of the national space capability. The House reduced this amount by $9,900,000.

The Senate amendment No. 3 restored this reduction. Since subsequent developments and NASA testimony disclosed that this funding will facilitate better planning and provide essential information for future program decisions, the managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate amendment. Thus the total amount approved for advanced missions program is $26 million.

Amendment No. 4: NASA requested $190,000 for the space astronomy program. The House bill reduced this
amount, to $174,300,000, representing reduction in the ORBITING Astronomical Observatory, ORBITING Solar Observatory and ORBITING Geophysical Observatory projects. The Senate amended the amount in this category, reducing it to $145,400,000. This reduction was justified by the House on the basis that the $6,500,000 devoted to the last three of a total of eight ORBITING Geophysical Observatories should be reduced to $2,500,000. This amount, during the 1964 through 1968 period and that the last three observatories might be deferred during the period beyond 1968. The House was not convinced, in view of past launch experience, that the planned launching of two geophysical observatories each year was realistic or that the lifetime of an observatory would not be increased beyond the 1-year lifetime predicted by NASA. Therefore, the House recommended that the NASA launch schedule be amended to provide for the launching of one geophysical observatory each year, instead of the two which were planned for activities which would take place 5 to 7 years after the date that funds were provided. The Senate amended the bill by deferring any action on the last three observatories until future year presentations, at which time a more meaningful evaluation could be made, in the opinion of the House. The restoration was made by the Senate because of persuasive testimony presented in connection with the Senate amendment No. 16 restored this item. The managers on the part of the Senate concurred in the Senate amendment No. 16 restored this item. The managers on the part of the Senate concurred in the Senate amendment No. 16 restored $10,245,500 of this amount. In view of additional NASA testimony presented to the Senate on this item, the managers on the part of the Senate agreed to a limited restoration of $6,500,000. The $6,500,000 is to be applied to the equipments and components portion of the program, and $3,500,000 is to be applied to network operations. The total amount authorized for this item is $681,500,000.

Amendment No. 7: NASA requested $287,900,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The House bill approved this item for $21,491,000. Senate amendment No. 7 restored $9,500,000 of this reduction. In view of additional NASA testimony presented to the Senate on this item, the managers on the part of the Senate agreed to a limited restoration of $6,500,000. Consequently, the managers on the part of the Senate concurred in the Senate amendment No. 9 restored this item. Testimony by the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the Senate of the necessity of this amount. Consequently, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendment No. 8: The Senate amendment specifies the location of the Electronics Research Center as the Boston, Mass., area.

Amendments Nos. 11 through 16: NASA requested $224,910,000 for the Office of Manned Space Flight for construction of facilities. The House reduced this amount by $21,491,000. This Senate amendment No. 9 restored this item. The Senate version of the bill restored $10,245,500. In conference, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of these construction items. Further, the conference agreement recommends that Congress appropriate for the John F. Kennedy Space Center. It is the sense of the conference that the restored funds will allow start of construction of the necessary public facilities.

An additional restoration of $1,070,000 for an Apollo Network Ground Station in the Northwest Pacific area contained in Senate amendment No. 16 was originally deferred by the House. Subsequently, NASA selected a site at Guam for this tracking station. Later testimony indicated that this construction of this station must be started at once if it is to be operational when needed. In view of the foregoing, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration.

Amendment No. 12: NASA requested $641 million for administrative operations. The Senate amended this amount to $530,180,500. The Senate amended the House request by $51,491,000, resulting in an authorization of $595,755,000 for administrative operations.

Amendment No. 18: This is a conforming amendment which revises the ceiling related to construction of facilities in keeping with the actions of the conference.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the results of the conference on H.R. 10456, the 1965 space authorization bill, follow the policy of our House Science and Astronautics Committee in strictly evaluating NASA budgetary requests.

The House conferences went to the conference fully aware that the Senate conferees had been guided by the more lenient policy of the Senate Space Committee in the previous year, that is, NASA was authorized for the fiscal year 1965 by $76,494,000, which is a substantial saving, without hurting the space program. It is personally rewarding to me to have been part of the people in the House working to save this $76,494,000 during the coming fiscal year, for the American taxpayers.

We have attempted to provide NASA with the money adequate to fulfill its objectives. At the same time, we have tried to impress upon NASA the need for strict budgetary controls. In a real way, NASA has been experiencing the critical review of the House Science and Astronautics Committee through its NASA Oversight Subcommittee. I need only to point to what the
Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a bill authorizing over $5 billion, there were relatively few differences between the House and the Senate. As a matter of fact, there was approximately $52 million difference between the two Houses, and you can readily see that this represents only approximately 1 percent of the total.

After conference we have adjusted total appropriations authorized in H.R. 10456 to slightly over $5.2 billion. Permit me to take a few moments to briefly advise the House of the results of the conference.

The first item to be considered was NASA's advanced missions program, for which it was asking $26 million. The House reduced this by $12 million. The Senate receded and agreed to a limited restoration of $6 million and thus compromised with the Senate on this program.

The House eliminated NASA's request for construction of a flight simulator for the advanced aircraft facility at Ames Research Center. Testimony given the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the House that a real need exists for this simulator in order to conduct necessary experiments with superconductive transports and to meet requirements of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Defense Department. For this reason the managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendments 11 through 16 in the conference report all pertain to construction items. The House had reduced these items by $21,490,000 in order to require NASA to perform more austere construction. The Senate had reduced the NASA budgetary request for these items by 5 percent, and the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate figure, because it was felt that the House reduction had been too severe.

The major portion of these facilities are operational in nature and are in support of the flight schedule for Gemini and Apollo, and because of the fact that two of the facilities were deferred until future year presentations.

The Senate amendment restored $12,300,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program whereas the House had deleted this amount from the NASA budgetary request. We were successful in maintaining our position, and the Senate receded and agreed to the full $12,300,000 reduction.

NASA requested $46 million for the sustaining university program. The House bill authorized the entire amount because this represented only a very modest increase in the level of effort of fiscal year 1964, and it was felt that the $46 million requested by NASA's advanced missions program, for which the House reduced this by $12 million. The Senate receded and agreed to the full $46 million reduction.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**Mr. MILLER** of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.
in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the following title:


BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have lived through many years, and have seen many changes. Life is change and there is no enduring status quo. This is the second day of July and all about us are the signs and insignia of summer and ahead are weeks of the heat and the sunshine and the glory and the beauty of summertime. Yet for 11 days summer has been in the path of death. After June 21 the days started to shorten and even while we were in the midst of summer we had started on our course to fall and the chills of winter. Without change, constant change, that we fight from noticing and acknowledging there could be no life.

May I say to the Yankee from New Hampshire, who weeps and wails with my good and beloved friends from the Southland at the grave of the status quo of the yesteryear, that there will be a new today and a new tomorrow and that life will go on. May I say to him that life could not go on, because change is the very essence of life, if it remained handcuffed to a status quo as remote as the old slave days when the ancestors of so many whom we brought to our shores, slaves to be bartered in as animals in the field.

Mr. Speaker, the old order has passed. Ours is a God-fearing and a God-respecting country. I am 82 and the farther I walk toward the western sunset the more I am confirmed in my own faith that all individuals and all nations are the instruments of a Divine purpose. That, Mr. Speaker, is my faith. That, Mr. Speaker, is my interpretation of my wide reading of the history of mankind in all the centuries as it has been recorded.

I have lived a long life. I am the oldest member of this great, distinguished, and historic body. I regard today as one of the great and meaningful dates in the history of mankind in its long and tedious climb to the heights. Mr. Speaker, in the closeness we have come to the brotherhood of men with the purpose of the Divine, this has been one of the happiest and most soul-satisfying days of my life.
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The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House, House Concurrent Res-
The celebration is a reminder that this relatively new group of arrivals is becoming more and more firmly rooted in the city.

Living is by no means easy for perhaps the majority of Puerto Ricans who have decided to settle permanently in the continental United States. Certainly, they have many problems of adjustment in Springfield, and the obstacles to be removed before many Puerto Ricans can really feel at home here and in most of the other areas where they are newcomers.

However, we believe Springfield as a whole is sympathetic of these new arrivals, and the dedicated people of good will on hand to extend help, that, in the long run that the most likely to be successfully removed will be marked progress in this direction already.

That it will continue, despite hindrances and even not unfounded.
at Haverford College to be a cornerstone of education in a free society.

But, we may ask Dr. Benton, how long will the society stay free when the furnishing of aid and comfort to the enemies of our freedom is regarded permissively by our educational leaders? To categorize the activities of the Haverford Vietcong sympathizers as "open-minded and free inquiry" is a new height not in academic freedom but in academic fatuousness. With this kind of abject surrender among our educational leaders, it is small wonder that some Haverford students are so misguided as to have embarked on such a misguided venture.

Dr. Benton refers to acting with conviction "within the bounds of law." In this regard, I have sent a letter of inquiry to the Department of Justice to ascertain pertinent laws covering the Haverford pro-Vietcong movement, and to ask what action, if any, is possible to curb the active support by our educational leaders for the Vietcong.

Our Government, as our schoolchildren can recite, is based on a system of checks and balances. But the balance is not as often as we like to believe.

The notion of a plebiscitary form of government, of a people speaking directly, through force of numbers alone, was rejected. To the founders, the people were not a mass, but collections of persons united into groups by their varying interests.

The proper majority rule and minority right was to be maintained through the division of government into a many-layered structure. Its parts would be appointed in dissimilar manner, to give representation and voice to the diversity of groups, interests, factions, and sects which underlie the American Nation.

"The notion of a plebiscitary form of government, of a people speaking directly, through force of numbers alone, was rejected. To the founders, the people were not a mass, but collections of persons united into groups by their varying interests."

In Federalist 10, Madison wrote of the dangers of the plebiscitary form. When numerical majority elects directly, he said, there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party, or an obnoxious minority. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property; and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

On June 15, the U.S. Supreme Court altered this political theory drastically through its decision that both houses of bicameral State legislatures must be based on the same principle, that of population.

Both houses must be elected on the same basis, and diversity where it exists must cease. Numbers alone must rule, and the Court has declared, taking still another step toward the plebiscitary form of government which the founders so greatly feared.

I shall not detail my objections to the Constitution that it has authority over a State's form of government. They are strong objections.

But I cannot let this decision pass without urging that we recognize its vast significance and the drastic change which it makes in our traditional American political theory. This change is too important to come about without great thought, debate and deliberation, and proper persuasion.

The premise upon which our Government was constructed must not be changed by an act of will on the part of a few who, no matter how fine their motives or character, do not represent the wonderful diversity of America which their decision works to injure.

CONRAD HONORS CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, under the leadership of the new national president, Adm. Edgar H. Reeder, of Montana, honored on today three congressional leaders for distinguished service to the national defense and Organized Reserve units and summer programs: Captain Charles H. George, New York; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; and Harry R. Sheppard, California.

At a luncheon attended by Members of Congress, Reserve Officers Association officers and press representatives, the honorees were presented with honorary life memberships in the Reserve Officers Association.

AMERICA SHOULD REMAIN A SANCTUARY FOR DIVERSITY

Mr. POOL. 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. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as persons and as a people, we construct our lives upon certain foundation principles.

When those principles change, the change should come as the result of painful creation, accompanied by clear recognition of the alteration and its significance.

I am deeply disturbed that we as a people are not cognizant of an alteration in basic American political theory which has taken place here in the early days of this midcentury summer.

Our Government, as our schoolchildren can recite, is based on a system of checks and balances. But the balance goes beyond the formal division of the Government into legislative, judicial, and executive branches, and even beyond the deliberate diffusion of powers to create natural jealousies of each branch toward growth of power of another.

Our Constitution, as the Vietcong had pointed out, the belief, which Madison and Hamilton enunciated for us in the Federalist Papers, that government by the people could not long endure without checks upon the power of a numerical majority to override a minority.

Mr. HAMILTON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to authorize the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government to deposit amounts due to any individual as salary by means of single checks payable to banks and other financial institutions for the accounts of individuals. The bill is intended to facilitate such deposits to the accounts of employees at least cost to the Government, and with greater convenience to the employees, the agencies, and the financial institutions concerned.

The mailing of salary checks directly to banks is an entirely voluntary practice which may be requested by employees, and which is in fact used by many personnel for their convenience. In the military services, many officers and enlisted personnel have long requested this service, and frequently the disbursing offices have simply consolidated the amounts due to any individuals who use the same bank, and mailed a single check. Accompanying bills make clear the names and amounts due to each individual. The procedures save the time of distributing checks on the job, of cashing the checks, and the costs of handling and mailing individual checks instead of single ones to banks used by many employees.

The bill is necessary to overcome a technical objection of the Comptroller General that payments by this method are not compatible with personal security, or the rights of property, and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

The Comptroller General notes that payments by this method are not compatible with personal security, or the rights of property, and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

On June 15, the U.S. Supreme Court altered this political theory drastically through its decision that both houses of bicameral State legislatures must be based on the same principle, that of population.

Both houses must be elected on the same basis, and diversity where it exists must cease. Numbers alone must rule, and the Court has declared, taking still another step toward the plebiscitary form of government which the founders so greatly feared.

I shall not detail my objections to the Constitution that it has authority over a State's form of government. They are strong objections.

But I cannot let this decision pass without urging that we recognize its vast significance and the drastic change which it makes in our traditional American political theory. This change is too important to come about without great thought, debate and deliberation, and proper persuasion.

The premise upon which our Government was constructed must not be changed by an act of will on the part of a few who, no matter how fine their motives or character, do not represent the wonderful diversity of America which their decision works to injure.
authorize these procedures by all the agencies of Government, it is expected that the savings in time, cost, and mailing will be available not only to the military departments, but to all agencies and their employees. In short, this is a bill to promote economy and efficiency in the administration of Government.

SENATE RINGS DOWN CURTAIN ON THE BOBBY BAKER SCANDALS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, the Rules Committee of the other body says the curtain has been rung down on the Bobby Baker scandals. There is no more ground to be covered, it is said.

That apparently means the rug under which it has been swept is big enough to cover all the ground.

What about the testimony of Don Reynolds, the Maryland insurance broker and the statements of Walter Jenkins, White House adviser? Either Reynolds or Jenkins committed perjury.

What about the expensive stereo? Mr. Alben W. Barkley has given it his blessing.

Who caused Ely Rometisch, the German call girl, to be deported overnight, and why?

These and scores of other questions dealing with this sordid mess demand answers, not evasion or alibis.

MEMBERS ATTENDING THE INTERPARLIMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place the list of Members who are going to attend the Interparliamentary Conference in August in the Record at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The list referred to follows:

W. R. Poage; Charles B. Houghten; Thos. C. Tollefson; E. Ross Adair; H. Allen Smith of California; Emilio Q. Dadario; Alexander Pirie; Chalmers; Dewittsey; P. Branchford Morse; Robert McCloy; and Katharine St. George, president.

Alternates: Paul C. Jones of Missouri and Gerald R. Ford.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONVEY EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY THE CONGRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 179, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as special committee to convey to the Members of the American Association of State Highway Officials an expression of appreciation by the Congress of the praiseworthy accomplishments under their leadership, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Fallon and Mr. Cramer.

The AMERICAN EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1962, some 6 weeks before I took office, the TFX supersonic airplane contract was awarded to the General Dynamics Co. in Fort Worth, Tex. Although I was not a Member of Congress in 1962, while the negotiations for the contract were being conducted, like many of the residents of Seattle, I was keenly interested. Since taking office, I have made an effort to determine the facts of the case. The amazing thing about the awarding of this contract was that the Boeing Co. proposed to build the supersonic TFX at an estimated $415 million less than did General Dynamics. At the same time, the Boeing design offered superior design and flight characteristics over the competing proposal.

It is my opinion that all the facts of this case should be made public so that the unjust methods of awarding this contract will never be used again. There are some who would prefer to sweep the whole TFX mess under the rug even though they know that this contract was awarded on an unfair basis. I feel that I have an obligation to bring the known facts of the case before the public so that they might judge the case for themselves.

The TFX supersonic fighter-bomber was originally conceived in 1959 by the Air Force Tactical Air Command. It will be a Mach 1/3 aircraft at high altitude and a Mach 2 aircraft at treetop level. It will have the capability of flying non-stop to Europe, carrying a nuclear weapon, and then it will have the capability of loitering over a given area at subsonic speed to keep the enemy occupied. It will be able to land on a 1,700-foot strip.

Mr. McNamara, when he became Secretary of Defense, decided he would expand the concept of the TFX and make it available to both the Air Force and the Navy. This decision has been because the aircraft, as conceived, was much too long to fit into the elevators of aircraft carriers and it had to be redesigned to be made shorter and to have a beefed-up tail section to absorb the shock-landing. There were to have been 1,700 TFX aircraft built; 235 of which were to go to the Navy. That number has been expanded to 383, in the light of Australia's interest. The total contract will be worth about $7 billion. The fact that the TFX is the largest defense contract ever awarded makes this affair of national interest.

Let us examine a chronology of the evaluations of the Military Source Selection Board made up of both the Air Force and the Navy and see to whom they would have awarded this contract. The source selection boards are the groups that are normally used to evaluate airplane contracts.

The source selection board made its first decision in January 1962 when the board voted unanimously in favor of Boeing. Next, it was decided to reevaluate and the companies submitted new proposals. The source selection board made its second recommendation in May of 1962 and once again it was unanimous in favor of the Boeing Co. Another reevaluation was ordered and on June 21, the source selection board made its third recommendation, and once again it was unanimous in favor of the Boeing design. At this particular stage there was complete accord by both the Navy and the Air Force in favor of the Boeing design, and this design was considered to be fit for immediate production. But, once again, for some unknown reason, the contracts were made to be reevaluated. Then an interesting thing happened. On October 24, 1962, a newspaper reporter by the name of Seth Kantor published an article in the Fort Worth Press that said that the General Dynamics Co. was going to be awarded the TFX contract. On November 2, 1962, the source selection board met once again and unanimously recommended that the Boeing Co. be awarded the TFX contract. On November 8, 1962, recommended the Boeing Co. for the contract. The reasons for the recommendation of the Boeing Co. were that they had a superior design, superior performance, and a price that was estimated $415 million less than the General Dynamics bid. But then, on November 24, 1962, the Department of Defense announced that the award was to be made to the General Dynamics Co. of Fort Worth, Tex.

On February 26, 1963, the Senate Investigating Subcommittee began hearings on the TFX which have not been completed to this day. The hearings, though not complete have been enlightening. A gentleman by the name of Albert Blackburn, who was a former Marine major and test pilot, worked on the TFX evaluation for the Department of Defense. As Lt. Colonel Blackburn made a point in the February 26th hearing article that he had implied that General Dynamics copied most of the superior design features of the Boeing proposal. Then Colonel Gayle of the Air Force, the test pilot, told the investigating Subcommittee, said that by constant reevaluation, both companies would eventually solve the problems and
that the reason for having so many reevaluations by the source selection board.

The previous performance of the two companies is very revealing. I mentioned earlier that the Boeing price was an estimated $415 million while the offer of the General Dynamics Co. and in times past the price has been a rather significant factor in the awarding of a contract. This is especially true when the accompanying design has superior performance capabilities.

The terms of the contract provided that the builder was liable for all costs over 120 percent of the bid price. The contract provided that the cost over 120 percent of the bid and up to 120 percent of the bid would be shared 90 percent by the Government and 10 percent by the contractor. The Boeing bid was at least 22 percent less than the General Dynamics bid. If the Boeing Co. had actually been so far wrong in their estimates that they had gone over 120 percent of their bid price, the cost to the Government and the taxpayers still would have been well below that of the General Dynamics' bid. So there was no foundation to the charge that the Boeing costs were unrealistically low.

The General Dynamics Co. had brought the P-102, the YF-17, and the F-60. On the other hand, the Boeing Co. in the same period of time has built the C-97, the B-47, the KC-135, and the B-52. We find that there are unusually good military airplane contracts, their performance cost was 4.8 percent below the American taxpayers' $210 million more than the American taxpayers' bid. On the other hand, the Boeing Co. in the same period of time has built the C-97, the B-47, the KC-135, and the B-52. We find that they had actually been 1.1 percent below the American taxpayers' bid. This saved the American taxpayers about $103 million. Obviously, the Boeing Co. had a history of completing their contracts at costs less than their bid prices.

On May 5, 1963, on the floor of the House I proposed that we have a competition between the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. and that both companies would build prototypes. This has been done before in the awarding of airplane contracts. On May 1, 1963, Senator McCLELLAN became interested in this idea. After making an inquiry, he found that the Boeing Co. could provide four prototypes of the TFX for less than $250 million. The General Dynamics Co. never did come up with a definite cost proposal, but it was estimated that it would probably cost them something under $300 million. When we had back a prototype in addition, we could still end up saving the American taxpayers quite a bit of money and still get a superior airplane for both the Air Force and the Navy. Just a small superiority in the air would make a lot of the shooting actually start.

A very serious ramification of this new method of awarding military contracts is the morale factor of the military in the Pentagon. I have talked to military people who say that the morale of the military is at an all-time low because of the way in which it is used in awarding the TFX contract.

Another ramification is the lowering of morale of American industry. In times past, in our free enterprise system, companies have been motivated in rewarding to bid on various defense contracts because the company that came up with the best design and had the lowest price was going to get the contract. We have never believed that now other factors may have some bearing on awarding defense contracts. If contracts are not to be awarded on a best performance basis and best price basis, then industry will question whether or not it should go to the bother and spend the time and the money that are necessary to make bids on large military contracts.

I would like to examine some of the principal overt charges that were made against the Boeing Co. to show that the TFX contract that went to Secretary of Defense McNamara. In this particular memorandum, the Boeing bid was inflated by $77 million. Now, that was not a major mistake, but during the hearings Mr. Zuckert argued that this actually helped the Boeing performance data was incorrect. The first of these is Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert. Mr. Zuckert admitted in his testimony that he had been a bad mistake in a memorandum that went to Secretary of Defense McNamara. In this particular memorandum, the Boeing bid was inflated by $77 million. Now, that was not a minor mistake, but during the hearings Mr. Zuckert argued that this actually helped the Boeing Co. have reason to believe that now other factors may have some bearing on awarding defense contracts. If contracts are not to be awarded on a best performance basis and best price basis, then industry will question whether or not it should go to the bother and spend the time and the money that are necessary to make bids on large military contracts.

I would now like to get into the part played by then Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth. First of all, he was Assistant Secretary of the Army while a certain intercept missions were incorrectly assigned to the General Dynamics design. Of course, these mistakes made the General Dynamics design look somewhat better, according to an intercept of the Air Force, said that all errors in the memorandum favored the General Dynamics design and that he just could not figure out how all of this had happened.

I would now like to get into the part played by then Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth. First of all, he was Assistant Secretary of the Army while a certain intercept missions were incorrectly assigned to the General Dynamics design. Of course, these mistakes made the General Dynamics design look somewhat better, according to an intercept of the Air Force, said that all errors in the memorandum favored the General Dynamics design and that he just could not figure out how all of this had happened.

Fred Korth was the president of the Continental National Bank when it approved a loan for some $400,000 to the General Dynamics Co. after the General Dynamics Co. had suffered a $425 million loss on the Convair 880 transport. This is the largest loss of any private company in the history of the world. By coincidence this figure is amazingly similar to the loss of $415 million between Mr. Korth and another director of the Board of Directors of the Continental National Bank. That is perfectly legitimate. In 1955 Mr. Korth became Secretary of the Army. After Frank Pace became the Assistant Secretary of the Army while a certain intercept missions were incorrectly assigned to the General Dynamics design. Of course, these mistakes made the General Dynamics design look somewhat better, according to an intercept of the Air Force, said that all errors in the memorandum favored the General Dynamics design and that he just could not figure out how all of this had happened.

Fred Korth was active in behalf of the bank after he became Navy Secretary. On October 19, 1962, Leon Jordan, vice president and comptroller of the Continental National Bank, wrote Fred Korth as follows:

While it is true that our deposits have shown very good increases, I happen to know that it has been you who has sent some of these deposits to us and I don't recall at the moment, but suffice to say that this is probably more
business than the people who are primarily responsible for new business have gotten in the last 2 or 3 months. So may I add my thanks to you.

Mr. Korth also used the U.S. Navy yacht Sequoia to entertain officials of the bank and clients of the bank. A fellow by the name of Phil Reagan, who is quite a famous singer, I understand, de­
ded to the Continental Bank shortly after an excursion on the Sequoia. Reagan quipped in a letter to Korth:

If you keep your fingers crossed and my good luck continues, my deposit might well be there until hell freezes over.

And Korth replied:

We were indeed fortunate that we were able to have you and Jo aboard the Sequoia when you were here in Washington, and I hope you will let me know when you plan on having another visit with us.

If this is not a clear case of conflict of interest, then I doubt if one exists. Mr. Korth was allowed to resign his post as Secretary of the Navy.

Before becoming Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric was a partner in the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore. Mr. Gilpatric said in his testi­mony that the law firm worked for both the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. This was denied and refuted by the Boeing Co. They said that all Mr. Gil­

patric had ever done for them was to appear as a witness in a court case and had received no attorney's fees whatever from the Boeing Co.

Mr. Gilpatric was in charge of the General Dynamics account for his law firm. The interesting thing about the relationship was that Cravath, Swaine & Moore received $268,000 in legal fees from General Dynamics between 1958 and 1962. In the first quarter of 1963 they were paid $31,500. Obviously, General Dynamics was a very lucrative ac­
count for Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

When Mr. Gilpatric took a leave of ab­

sence from his law firm and became Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1961, Mr. Moore of that firm took over the General Dynamics account. After the law firm were so highly thought of by General Dynamics that they made Mr. Moore a member of the board of direc­tors of their company. Because of the closeness of the relationship between Mr. Gilpatric and the General Dynamics Co., I doubt very much if he could render an objective judgment on any contract in which they might be involved. I do not thing that there is a clear cut case of conflict of interest on the part of Mr. Gilpatric.

Mr. Gilpatric was also allowed to re­

sign and has returned to his law firm of Cravath, Swaine, and Moore.

The fourth character that we should examine is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Mr. McNamara has not been fully examined by the subcommittee as yet, so all of the facts of his role are not known. That he wasboss of the other two men there is no doubt.

One of his principal arguments against the Boeing design was that it used too much titanium. He indicated that tita­
nium was untested and that he was not sure it would be satisfactory for use in super sonic airplanes. While he was making these statements, the top secret A-11 aircraft which utilizes large quanti­
ties of titanium was successfully flying. Either Mr. McNamara did not know what was going on in the Defense Department or he was deliberately trying to mislead the subcommittee.

McNamara also argued that the "commo­
nality" of the Air Force and Navy ver­sions proposed by General Dynamics was great. This myth has since been ex­

ploded and reports indicate that their Navy version will have to be drastically modified in order to be usable. The "commonality" of the two versions is less day by day.

Mr. McNamara should be recalled be­

fore the Senate Investigations Subcom­
mittee for a full explanation of his past statements.

That there were highly irregular meth­
ods used in the awarding of the TFX, there is no doubt. Just how far out of line all of the characters wandered, we will not know until the matter is fully examined by the Senate Investigations Sub­

committee. This committee has a re­

sponsibility to the American people to investigate completely and disclose their findings.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED:

100,000 NEW NURSING HOME BEDS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Curran) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recos and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in following the pro­
gress of medical facilities available to the general population of the United States. There is a need in the healing arts field and increased quali­

ty, quantity, and variety of health insu­

rance are the areas where we really need to operate, more pleasant, more bene­

ficial, and less costly to the patient than are the older homes.

I will continue to be interested in well­

planned, properly staffed, and equipped nursing homes providing high caliber care. Those interested in keeping down the cost of medical care to a reasonable level must keep alert to any opportunity to bring about facilities and other im­

provements which reduce these costs.

Now, if I may say so, it is about time the Department of Health, Educa­tion, and Welfare started reporting to the people and to the Congress the amazing progress being made in recent years in the availability of medical facilities, the increased number, the increased productivity and the im­

proved quality of skills of the people en­
gaged in the healing arts field of en­

deavor, and in the extension of health insu­

urance to cover more of our people with broader coverage and with a greater selectivity of the kind of policy best suited to the individual person or family needs.

To date the Department of Health, Edu­

cation, and Welfare and its support­ing clique in the Congress and outside Government has not been accentuating the positive and eliminating the nega­tive. On the contrary, it has been ac­

centuating the negative, messing with
Mr. Inbetwix and in the process actually slowing down the positive.

Now that medicare has been put on the shelf, I hope for good, cannot, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its allies get into the spirit of progress in our society to work with it and not against it? Let the Department start reporting what is good about America. Studying and reporting success is the best way to help to eliminate failure and put those in between up on the high road of better living.

In the next week or so the Health Insurance Council will be putting out its 18th annual survey of the extent of voluntary health insurance coverage in the United States and I will again take the floor to point out the amazing progress which has been going on in this field. I again want to emphasize that this progress is being made in spite of the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare officials not with which should be the case, their understanding and cooperation.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY UNDERTAKES EXTENSIVE WATER RESEARCH PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution, from all sources, has long been of major concern to our people. Long before there was legislation on the Federal level, State, and local efforts had been directed toward the control of water pollution. The earliest of these programs seems to have been the statute that was enacted in Pennsylvania in 1905. Even hasty research will disclose that about 14 different States had passed similar legislation before Congress, in 1965, enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This act declared a congressional policy of support and aid to States and municipalities conducting technical research in the field of prevention and control of water pollution. While these efforts have yielded significant results in the past, much more has yet to be accomplished.

Federal, State, and local governments are not alone in their concern for the preservation of water quality. For some time the American chemical industry has translated concern into action and embarked last month upon an extensive research program designed to determine how organic chemicals act in streams, lakes, and rivers and how treatment processes for sanitary sewage react upon these chemicals.

This research program, under the sponsorship of the Society of Manufacturing Chemists' Association, will be under the direction of Dr. D. W. Ryckman, chairman of the environment and sanitary engineering division of Washington University at St. Louis. Dr. Ryckman, who is widely recognized as a specialist in biochemistry and bioengineering, is a graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, has a master of science degree from Michigan State University, and doctor of science degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This research project is expected to run from 2 to 5 years and has been developed into three basic activities. They are:

First. A compilation and critical examination of related technical data on organic chemicals;

Second. A laboratory research program on the degree and rate at which organic chemicals break down and disappear under biological action, and classification of bio-organisms with regard to their relative effectiveness in this regard;

Third. A field study to verify the laboratory program.

It is expected that the information developed from this research program will not only help chemical companies, but will help other industries plan their water resources management.

I think it might be well to note the remarks made by Gen. George H. Decker, president of MCA, when he announced this program. He said:

This research project reflects a continuing effort on the part of the industry to help maintain a high degree of clear water both for the general public and for its own use. Results from this research should enable chemical companies to plan with regard to manufacturing wastes and also to better advise their customers concerning the handling and use of their products.

In this current research effort and in other programs, the chemical industry has been responsive to its responsibilities in the field of water pollution control. For more than 25 years, the industry, through the Manufacturing Chemists Association, has maintained a constant watch on water quality problems caused by chemical production. Just recently the MCA has undertaken a survey of the chemical industry's investment in water pollution control facilities at 875 chemical plants, involving 125 different chemical manufacturing concerns throughout the United States. I would like to include in this Record at this time the tabulation by States of the waste treatment applied water pollution control facilities of these responsible members of our private enterprise system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of reporting chemical plants</th>
<th>Number of different communities</th>
<th>Total employment represented</th>
<th>Capital investment next 5 years</th>
<th>Projected additional investment over next 5 years</th>
<th>Current annual operating cost</th>
<th>Current animal waste power requirements (in animal waste power requirements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>3,060,000</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rounded to nearest $1,000. 2 Less than $1,000.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will note that over $263 million has been spent in the past, and another $69.7 million is to be spent in the next 5 years. These same concerns are spending $5.5 million annually for research in this field alone. In Missouri, for example, capital investment by chemical facilities on waste treatment amounts to more than $3.6 million. In addition, 17 chemical plants...
in 9 Missouri communities plan to spend over $1.7 million during the next 5 years to improve water quality.

I have been saying over the years that private enterprise can and often does accept responsibility in preserving our natural resources. This example of one industry in one specific field is not a mere isolated incident. The same is being done in many other fields which impinge on our American way of life. I think that the chemical industry is to be commended for its efforts in water quality preservation. Continued research and public education-as the program presently with State and local programs, will do much to prevent the contamination of this precious natural asset and preserve it for future generations.

Heller-Wallich Correspondence Illuminates Concept of the Full Employment Budget

Mr. Mosher. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate over the tax cut the administration made widespread use of the concept of the "full employment budget," as a tool of analysis designed to demonstrate the magnitude of the "brake" on the economy exerted by Federal fiscal policy.

In simplest terms, the "full employment budget" is intended to show what the budget surplus or deficit—national income accounts basis—would be if the economy were operating at full employment, defined at a constant 4-percent unemployment rate. The surplus in the "full employment budget" is considered too large. When after the elimination of the surplus private spending, is insufficient to bring total output to the full employment level. This was the situation which the administration said existed prior to the recent tax cut.

The importance which the administration attached to the concept in the tax cut debate led me to believe that in the future it was likely to be used as an even more important guide to fiscal policy. For that reason I wrote Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, on February 11, asking a number of questions about the concept and about the administration's assertion that its fiscal program would provide a greater net fiscal stimulus to the economy this year than in any other postwar year. I also asked for estimates of the full employment surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

I am pleased to reply to my letter of April 27, Dr. Wallich's letter of June 25 in the Record at this point:

Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Heller: In his economic report the President says that the administration's program will produce a "net stimulus" this year than in any other peacetime year in history. I would appreciate it if you would set forth the reasoning and figures upon which this statement is based.

I am also curious about whether you consider the administration's expenditure policy that year stimulative or not. In the present economic report you state that "the tax and expenditure program will give a bigger fiscal stimulus in 1964 than in any of the past 3 years." However, in reply to questions which I submitted to you at the Joint Economic Committee's annual hearings you say "the spending side of the Federal budget can hardly be considered stimulative in 1964." Because of the importance of a correct understanding of the concept of the full employment surplus, I would also appreciate your setting down in detail the figures upon which you base your statement that there will be a smaller surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

With best wishes and many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS

Chairman of Economic Advisers,

HOR. THOMAS B. CURTIS, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Curtis: I am pleased to reply to your letter of February 11, 1964, requesting us to set forth the reasoning and figures upon which the President based his statement that the 1964 fiscal program will provide a greater net stimulus than in any previous peacetime year.

We delayed our reply because at the time of receipt of your request, there was under way a full-scale interagency review of the full employment budget estimates on the President's statement was based. This review was expected to produce new and more refined estimates of the full employment budget. This work is now completed, and I am pleased to report that the new estimates do not differ significantly from the previous ones.

As you know, the Council holds that the full employment budget on a national income accounts basis yields a measure of the impact of the Federal fiscal system on our national product and income. The expenditures side of this budget is an estimate of what, under conditions of full employment, would be the total of Federal purchases of goods and services, and (b) Federal transfer payments, subsidies, and grants-in-aid—all of which enter into demand for the output of business, and State and local governments.

The revenue figures show the withdrawal of potential private purchasing power that was not withdrawn from Federal tax collections as full employment.

Since the full employment budget is estimated at a constant 4-percent unemployment rate, it is necessary to estimate the Federal fiscal program independently of the strength or weakness of the forces (other than Federal expenditures and taxes) affecting private demand. Since the receipts and expenditures actually realized in any year are not independent of these forces, the actual budget outcome does not provide an adequate measure of the budget impact taken by itself. The basis for this analysis is set forth more fully in the 1962 and 1964 Economic Reports.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, responsible fiscal policy must—so far as practicable—be consistent with the strengthening of free enterprise—respond to the strength or weakness of private demand in such a way as not to have "any tendency . . . towards a maximum production," in a context of reasonable price stability (needed to maintain maximum purchasing power). With existing tax and expenditure policies and responsible price and wage decisionmaking, we believe that our interest in employment, under this criterion, should be to bring the unemployment rate down to no more than 4 percent.

The revenue figures show the withdrawal of potential private purchasing power that was not withdrawn from Federal tax collections as full employment.

The Council's economic report states that "The tax and expenditure program will give a bigger fiscal stimulus in 1964 than in any of the past 3 years." However, in reply to questions which I submitted to you at the Joint Economic Committee's annual hearings you say "the spending side of the Federal budget can hardly be considered stimulative in 1964." Because of the importance of a correct understanding of the concept of the full employment surplus, I would also appreciate your setting down in detail the figures upon which you base your statement that there will be a smaller surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

With best wishes and many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. HELLER

Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.
The two tables which follow set forth the movements in the full employment budget over the past four years and the projected movements in 1964.

Table 1 shows estimated full employment Federal revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit—estimated on the basis of the tax-rate structure that was in effect in 1960-61, on the actual contribution rate for the OASDI program, and the contribution rate to the unemployment compensation system that would have prevailed under full employment conditions.

Table 2 differs from Table 1 in that the revenue estimates reflect the effects of the 1962 Revenue Act, of the revised 1962 depreciation guidelines, and of the Revenue Act for 1964.

Since these numbers represent estimates of what would have happened if the economy had been at the 4-percent unemployment rate rather than the actual higher unemployment rates, the figures contain some element of conjecture. This is necessarily even more true for the 1964 estimates. Hence honest disagreement could arise over these numbers. However, we are confident that the margin for dispute would be small.

As these figures show, the budget would have been somewhat less restrictive in 1961 and 1962, somewhat more restrictive in 1963. The 1964 program involves a larger shift—namely $8 billion—in the direction of fiscal stimulus. This is above the combined stimulus of the preceding 3 years and exceeds the stimulus of any one year of the Eisenhower administration.

I hope that this exposition and the accompanying tables will serve to answer your inquiry. If we can be of further help, please call on us.

Sincerely,

WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman.

TABLE 1—Full-employment revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit under 1960-61 revenue system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Surplus (or deficit)</th>
<th>Net fiscal stimulus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Reduction of surplus from preceding year.

TABLE 2—Full-employment revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit reflecting 1962 tax and 1964 changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Surplus (or deficit)</th>
<th>Net fiscal stimulus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Revenue estimates reflect the effects of the 1962 Revenue Act, the actual contribution rate for the OASDI program, and the contribution rate to the unemployment compensation system that was estimated would have prevailed under full employment.
2 Reduction of surplus from preceding year.
fuse the discussion of fiscal policy in this country. A great deal of unreasoning prejudice exists against the use of deficits when they are inappropriate, just as there exists, in other branches of government, a certain sense when they are not appropriate. If the full employment surplus is used as the principal guide for fiscal policy, it is possible in the position of having to argue that a particular deficit is restraining and that a particular surplus is expansionary. It is more plausible to say that a particular deficit is not sufficiently expansionary or a particular surplus not restrictive enough. While the distinction is one of semantics, it also has an influence on people and on votes.

8. To summarize my remarks, I regard the full employment surplus as a valuable concept, but as statistically uncertain and as a very much less than adequate description of the effects of a particular budget. It would be regrettable if its elegance and seeming simplicity should tempt us to make more use of it than it can give.

Sincerely yours,

H. O. WALLACH.

CURB FCC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of correspondence between Mr. Philip McMartin, assistant public relations director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager and owner of radio station KTTR, operated by the so-called "Life Line" Broadcast Co. of Rolla, Mo.

Mr. McMartin's letter under date of June 15 calls on radio station KTTR to broadcast a taped interview by Mr. McMartin with Clyde Ellis, general manager and owner of radio station KTTR, Rolla, Mo., and the reply thereto under date of June 16, of Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager and owner of the station.

Mr. Speaker, I have had my attention directed to this correspondence to the attention of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I am directing this correspondence to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to the attention of the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in respect to jurisdiction over the Federal Communications Commission.

In doing so, I am urging the committee and the House to take prompt and effective action to counteract the iniquitous dictate in the FCC order of September 19, quoted by Mr. McMartin, and to counteract the equally iniquitous exploitation of this FCC rule by you and your organization.

The import of this FCC dictate clearly is to force the communications media to choose between silence on controversial issues, or bankruptcy.

Yours very truly,

AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

CAPTIVE NATIONS, 1964

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time many U.S. Representatives rise in this Chamber to address their remarks to the subject of Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we do this, for the subject is close to the hearts of millions of Americans. The term "captive nations" applies to those European nations which the Communists seized in the relatively short time between 1940 and 1948. The largest part of this takeover resulted from Communist expansion following the last World War, a legacy most disturbing to those who fought that War. World War II was a great effort of mankind in behalf of freedom and democracy. The world record of Soviet deceit and inhumanity resulted in the denial of freedom for almost one-quarter of Europe's people, living on one-third of the territory of that Continent.

The word "captive" means something to us when we realize that the formerly independent countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia are now in total political and social captivity under an imposed totalitarian regime. The Iron Curtain, which separates these countries from their free brothers in Europe and elsewhere in the world, was forged by the strong arm of the Soviet Army under orders of the foreign government in Moscow.

For what purpose, then, do we make this proclamation in 1964, here in that great representative body—the U.S. House of Representatives? I believe there are two benefits from the words that echo through this body. First, it serves to focus worldwide attention on the fact that so many people live in political bondage. We must never forget that these once independent peoples lost their freedom to an outside imposed force, terror, and violence. Secondly, this observance serves to remind Americans that millions have lost that cherished goal of mankind which we Americans live with every minute of every day—the freedom to think, say, and act as we wish.

America stands in striking contrast to life behind the Iron Curtain. We must never permit the Communists to over-shadow or extinguish the light this contrast tells the world. We must continue to stir men's minds with the freedom we now own. Men have always fought for what we have. Mankind has always been pulled toward the light of freedom, and fences and walls have never been able to stop them.

Let us be solemn about this occasion and in our observance let us prayerfully hope that someday these peoples in the captive nations will be free again by their own right and theirs—the freedom to guide their own life.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights problem is our Nation's greatest sickness which can only be cured by a moral revival.

Reestablishing that everyone is equal under the law by defining the rights guaranteed by the Constitution will help, but the only truly meaningful gain is when racial barriers are broken down by human hearts.

This will take some persuasion, but today, in our time, the civil rights bill paves the way for this eventuality. I hail its passage.
Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman William McCulloch and other Congressmen have submitted resolutions calling for a constitutional amendment to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. The necessity for this action arises from the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States recently. These decisions have the effect of dictating to the States an inflexible and rigid formula of equally populated legislative districts. While the Constitution provides that the law of the land, it is contrary to the principles of representative government upon which our Nation has been based. Just as the principle of territorial representation has been codified into the Federal Constitution in the formation of the U.S. Senate, the principle of some degree of geographical representation, as well as considerations which give weight to common interests of the people represented, have been a part of our State and local governmental systems since the conception of this Nation. The strongest principle of our system of government has been that of representation on a fair and equal basis for all concerned, not merely majority rule. Protection of the rights of the minority is guaranteed by the Constitution. Conditions relating to fairness and equality of representation differ from one State to another. By the States of the various States of the Nation, and can even differ widely within a particular State. For instance, to deprive southeastern Ohio of its present representation and have the area require direct attention under numerous State and Federal programs, would seem to me to be extremely unwise. Randall Metcalf, the Republican candidate for Congress in the 15th District in southeastern Ohio, has been pointing out the threat of the Court decisions to any reasonable voice for that area in the State councils in Columbus. After discussion of the matter by the thorough concern as to the implications of the Supreme Court decisions, and I believe that it is vital that we move with dispatch to correct them. My experience in the Ohio House of Representatives, where the southeast area is given voice related to geographic factors, conveys me that no undue favoritism was shown toward the problems of that area. By comparison, it was the Ohio Senate, elected on a straight ticket, that has defeated more proposals said to favor urban areas.

For these reasons, I have followed the lead of Congressman McCulloch and others and ask unanimous consent for a joint resolution differing slightly from the McCulloch proposal. It makes clear that population is one of the factors that can be considered, but not the exclusive factor. It also attempts to avoid the necessity for voter action statewide where that action has already taken place by constitutional amendment or initiative petitions or where such a remedy is immediately available.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO STATUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 27, Washington was the scene of a dramatic series of events revolving around the dedication of the Taras Shevchenko statue at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW. The dramatic climax to this great day took place at the unveiling of the statue with a major foreign policy address delivered by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask to have the full text of General Eisenhower's address printed in the Record at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AT THE UNVEILING OF THE MONUMENT TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 27, 1964

First, let me thank you for your generous welcome.

On September 13, 1960, when I signed into law a measure to authorize the erection of this statue, it was my expectation that you, Mr. Speaker, would have the privilege of delivering the introductory address. But let me not forget the ageless truth, "This, too, shall pass," and, until it does, we can be sure that this Nation will with its allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to fill any ill-advised attempt of dictators to seize any area where the love of freedom lives and blazes.

In the nations of East and Central Europe, in the nations of the U.S.S.R., and in Russia itself, where the poetry of Shevchenko is well known—there are millions of individuals who earnestly want the right of self-determination and self-government.

His statue, standing here in the heart of the nation's Capital, near the embassies of nearly every country in the world, is a shining symbol of his love of liberty. Shevchenko will here kindle a new world of liberty and human dignity have been lost in the non-Russian nations of the entire world. That dream has faded.

But let us not forget the ageless truth, "This, too, shall pass," and, until it does, we can be sure that this Nation will with its allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to fill any ill-advised attempt of dictators to seize any area where the love of freedom lives and blazes.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO STATUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 27, Washington was the scene of a dramatic series of events revolving around the dedication of the Taras Shevchenko statue at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW. The dramatic climax to this great day took place at the unveiling of the statue with a major foreign policy address delivered by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask to have the full text of General Eisenhower's address printed in the Record at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AT THE UNVEILING OF THE MONUMENT TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 27, 1964

First, let me thank you for your generous welcome.

On September 13, 1960, when I signed into law a measure to authorize the erection of this statue, it was my expectation that you, Mr. Speaker, would have the privilege of delivering the introductory address. But let me not forget the ageless truth, "This, too, shall pass," and, until it does, we can be sure that this Nation will with its allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to fill any ill-advised attempt of dictators to seize any area where the love of freedom lives and blazes.

In the nations of East and Central Europe, in the nations of the U.S.S.R., and in Russia itself, where the poetry of Shevchenko is well known—there are millions of individuals who earnestly want the right of self-determination and self-government.

His statue, standing here in the heart of the nation's Capital, near the embassies of nearly every country in the world, is a shining symbol of his love of liberty. Shevchenko will here kindle a new world of liberty and human dignity have been lost in the non-Russian nations of the entire world. That dream has faded.
But today, we stand together as Ameri­
cans and Ukrainians under the shadow of a system of self-government—a system that makes it possible for us to be different, and yet united; independent, yet interdependent; diverse, yet distinctive.

To be successful in bringing peace with freedom and justice to the world, we must in­
crease our awareness of the oppression around the world more aware that only in free­
dom can be found the right road to human progress, happiness, and fulfillment.

Shevchenko from us. And right this truth.

In unveiling this memorial to the great 19th century Ukrainian poet we encourage —
and, indeed, we command—those of us around the world to embody in their poetry mankind’s demands for freedom— for self-expression, for national inde­

pendence, and for liberty for all mankind.

It is indeed fitting that we here should remember the timeless and unending strug­

gle for freedom. We are equally proud of the me­

morial to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and other dedicated Americans who have

served to remind all who visit our Na­

tion’s Capital that we, as a people, share

a common and a noble heritage.

We are here today, only because he prayed for a Ukrainian George Washington. We honor Taras Shevchenko today not only because his unwavering faith in the right of all men to be free and independent.

It is a bit of irony that the Russian Com­
munists suddenly became aware of the great­

ness of Taras Shevchenko. Mr. Khrushchev

at the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko Monu­

ment on June 27, 1964, in Washing­
ton, D.C.)

President Eisenhower, Your Excellencies

metropolitans, archbishops and bishops of

the Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Churches, our friends of freedom, and ladies and gentle­

mens, today we observe a great American holi­

day, the birthday of our beloved country—The United States of America.

Taras Shevchenko, whose 150th anniver­
sary is observed this year by all Ukrainians

and lovers of freedom, is more than just an outstanding Ukrainian bard and advocate of a free and independent Ukraine. Taras Shevchenko was an Abraham Lincoln of his time; he visualized a voluntary union of all Slavic nations in Eastern Europe. He was an ardent believer in the freedom of all peo­

ples regardless of race, religion or nationality.

In the large sense of the word, Taras Shev­

chenko embodied all these principles on

the soil of his native homeland—Ukraine.
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its old trick, to be the first in everything, so they urged me to write one for the Ukrainian poet in Moscow on June 10, 1964, and Khrushchev made his usual attack on us for honoring Shevchenko here in Washington, a capital founded by a man to whom Shevchenko looked as ideal and inspiration of the Ukrainian nation.

My friend, Shevchenko belongs to you and to all of us who oppose the Russian Communist tyranny, because he opposed this ruthless and inhuman tyranny which oppresses every free man and woman in the world.

Yes, Taras Shevchenko is ours because he is a symbol of human liberty and justice, and humanity to follow.

Thank you.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. DERWINSKI AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, JUNE 27, 1964

Mr. Chairman, General Eisenhower, revered fathers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is especially appropriate that we dedicate this statue to Taras Shevchenko at a time when the Soviet Union is using propaganda and falsehoods to an unprepared world. We and all of the free world have committed to defeat of the Communist tyrants who have distorted the voice of Shevchenko for their own diabolic purposes. The dedication of this statue and the international interest it is receiving reduces the Red propaganda vehicle to shambles.

And it is fitting and appropriate that General Eisenhower has joined us in this dedication, just as Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada joined in the unveiling of a statue to Shevchenko which was erected by the citizens of Canada.

I direct your special attention to the fact that as dramatized by the inscription on the statue, that Shevchenko was a brave and clear voice for freedom, not only for his native Ukraine, but for all the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

As the Soviet Union continues its colonial policy, which in Eastern Europe is immediately identifiable with czarist imperial policies, Shevchenko's historic role as a symbol of resistance to autocracy and as a prophet of liberty is as important today as it was when he was wounded in the war and was given a house arrest in St. Petersburg, and he was called the Shevchenko's punishment of the czarist regime because he was an advocate of human rights. Shevchenko was an advocate of freedom for all the people in the old Russian empire, and his voice contributed directly to the abolishment of serfdom and the eventual collapse of the czarist government. It is our hope that his voice will contribute effectively to the collapse of the present Russian Government.

The statue of Shevchenko which has been replaced by Communist legitimation.

The denial of human rights under the czarist regime is perpetuated today by communism. Denial of self-determination to the non-Russian people of Eastern Europe is practiced today as it was under the czar.

Therefore, the unveiling of this statue to Shevchenko, the symbol of the free world, the capital of the free world, is especially symbolic. In the Ukraine, the tombstone of Shevchenko is a stone, an iron cross to dramatize his belief in the hope of Christianity for his people. But, as you can see, in Washington, I set down the cross and replaced it with a monument, in a deliberate attempt to falsify the ideals of Shevchenko.

Here in Washington his ideals, his principles, and his message cannot be falsified.
Last year's annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, submitted by President Kennedy, Congress refers to the studies made by that Agency. Quoting verbatim from one of these studies: "If today we in the free world will exploit modern age, his messages in poetry and deeds of one of the world's great poets and freedom fighters. Although the accomplishments of Taras Shevchenko, one of the world's great poets and freedom fighters, have reawakened in the minds of millions the human spirit for freedom and self-government.

This demonstration by the Ukrainian people was nothing but a continuation of the historic struggle of the Ukrainian people. It is a struggle that is being demonstrated back in the days of Taras Shevchenko. All true historians place Shevchenko as a leader in the struggle for human freedom. He was a fighter for liberty and awakened the enslaved nations to fight for freedom against carter, and later Communist, tyranny. In 1851, he published his poem 'The Prophet' and called the statement of Ralph Waldo Emerson that 'What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say,' I called attention to the fact that we fall all over ourselves to extend hospitality to the visiting host. The list of those who have been and are every peoples in whose behalf the resolution was drafted.

Only a few weeks later, on the eve of the shameful first visit of Khrushchev to the United States, that hangman of the Ukraine, in an article written for publication in this Congress journal, he characterized the Soviet Nations resolution as an act of provocation. With a frankness American leadership has not always matched, Khrushchev described the resolution as contrary to the concept of "peaceful coexistence" and declared that the policy of 'rolling back' communism can only poison the international atmosphere. Despite this clear declaration of tyranny's intention, the invitation to Khrushchev was not withdrawn and Washington's city became host.

The lesson of that experience is still not learned. We must maintain cultural exchanges with the regime whose axed and demonstrated purpose is further enslavement of nations and people.

The lesson is still not learned. We continue to send businessmen to Moscow, even after one member of such a delegation offered this commentary: "What shocked me most about the meeting (with Khrushchev) was the complete disregard for facts. I went away with a feeling that two distinguished Members of Congress from my own State of Michigan had a leading role in the congressional authorization for this statue voted by the 86th Congress in September 1960. I refer, of course, to my able colleague, the Honorable John Lesinski, and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley.

"When shall we get ourselves a Washington? To promulgate his new and righteous law." Today, under authorization of the Congress of the United States, an appropriate statue of Taras Shevchenko in the Capitol City which bears the name of his hero—Washington. My personal pride in being privileged to participate in this observance is heightened by the knowledge that two distinguished Members of Congress from my own State of Michigan had a leading role in the congressional authorization for this statue voted by the 86th Congress in September 1960. I refer, of course, to my able colleague, the Honorable John Lesinski, and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley.
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The lesson is still not learned—and Congress was kept in session last year until Christmas Eve so that it might reverse itself and approve underwriting of credit for wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

The lesson is still not learned—and only last week our highest Court held invalid the ban on issuance of passports to Americans harboring Nazis and other political exiles, in the powerful dissenting words of Mr. Justice Clark, enabling "the leaders of the world's foremost country" to "take their fellow citizens to the Latin Quarter by the arm." We become captives of our fears and place ourselves at the mercy of our blackmailers.

We do well to honor Shevchenko. For the sake of our own freedom—and the freedom of men and nations everywhere—let us honor him in deed as well as in word, in action as well as in statutory symbol.

"When shall we get ourselves a Washington?"

Mr. Speaker, because of the unprecedented nature of the Shevchenko statue unveiling—the new records scored in our Nation's Capital, a tremendous parade of the mighty from all parts of the globe, ever so many persons witnessing the unveiling of a statue—I believe all will agree that this event, in all its significant aspects, should become a permanent part of our Nation's history.

The House should recognize the following items to be printed in the Record:

First, a short account on "Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine—Fighter for Human Liberty"; second, an article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "America Hall's Shevchenko," which appeared in the Shevchenko Jubilee Memorial Book; third, an article by Neil A. Martin on "Taras Shevchenko, Both America and Russia Claim Ukrainian National As Hero"; fourth, an article by Dr. Dobriansky on "Taras Shevchenko Memorial Honorary Society"; fifth, a brief background account on "Ukraine: History and Present Status"; fourth, a concise statement on the "Significance of the Memorial Statue to Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine, and Fighter for Human Liberty"; fifth, a UPI article by Neil A. Martin on "Controversial Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine"; sixth, another article by Dr. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "America Meets Shevchenko," which appeared in the leading Ukrainian Catholic newspaper America on June 25; seventh, a commentary in Freedom's Facts, the publication of the All-American Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow; eighth, a commentary in Freedom's Star; ninth, an article by Dr. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine—Fighter for Freedom"; tenth, a brief account on the Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow; eleventh, a commentary in Freedom's Liberty; twelfth, a commentary in Freedom's Horizons; thirteenth, an article by Dr. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Taras Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow"; fourteenth, an article by Robert J. Lewis on "Taras Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhow"; fifteenth, an article by Robert J. Lewis on "Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhower"; sixteenth, an article by Robert J. Lewis on "Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow." This was written in 1846. In this year he published the poem, "The Caucasus." From this poem has been taken the "Prome-thian" theme for the memorial statue to Shevchenko in Washington, D.C.

Stirred by political currents which led to his release from his native Ukraine into Siberia and the Russian Empire, Shevchenko was sentenced to military exile in eastern Russia, where he met many Polish and Ukrainian exiles. He was pardoned and returned to St. Petersburg in 1858. In this year he wrote another great poem, "The Neophytes," a tale of ancient Rome and the persecution of the Christians.

The parallel between the tyrannical Nero and the Russian Czar was unmistakable. Shevchenko succeeded in freeing his family from serfdom in 1859.

The lesson is still not learned—and only last week our highest Court held invalid the ban on issuance of passports to Americans harboring Nazis and other political exiles, in the powerful dissenting words of Mr. Justice Clark, enabling "the leaders of the world's foremost country" to "take their fellow citizens to the Latin Quarter by the arm." We become captives of our fears and place ourselves at the mercy of our blackmailers.

We do well to honor Shevchenko. For the sake of our own freedom—and the freedom of men and nations everywhere—let us honor him in deed as well as in word, in action as well as in statutory symbol.
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First, a short account on "Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine—Fighter for Human Liberty"; second, an article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "America Hall's Shevchenko," which appeared in the Shevchenko Jubilee Memorial Book; third, a brief background account on "Ukraine: History and Present Status"; fourth, a concise statement on the "Significance of the Memorial Statue to Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine, and Fighter for Human Liberty"; fifth, a UPI article by Neil A. Martin on "Controversial Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine"; sixth, another article by Dr. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "America Meets Shevchenko," which appeared in the leading Ukrainian Catholic newspaper America on June 25; seventh, a commentary in Freedom's Facts, the publication of the All-American Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow; eighth, a commentary in Freedom's Star; ninth, an article by Dr. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Taras Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow"; fourteenth, an article by Robert J. Lewis on "Taras Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhow"; fifteenth, an article by Robert J. Lewis on "Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhower"; sixteenth, an article by Robert J. Lewis on "Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow." This was written in 1846. In this year he published the poem, "The Caucasus." From this poem has been taken the "Prome-thian" theme for the memorial statue to Shevchenko in Washington, D.C.

Stirred by political currents which led to his release from his native Ukraine into Siberia and the Russian Empire, Shevchenko was sentenced to military exile in eastern Russia, where he met many Polish and Ukrainian exiles. He was pardoned and returned to St. Petersburg in 1858. In this year he wrote another great poem, "The Neophytes," a tale of ancient Rome and the persecution of the Christians.

The parallel between the tyrannical Nero and the Russian Czar was unmistakable. Shevchenko succeeded in freeing his family from serfdom in 1859.
HESEVCHENO'S AFFINITY TO US AMERICANS

THe DREAM

"The Dream": (1845) Translated by Vera Rich.

June 27, 1964, will perhaps in your heart for all ages you honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which, loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage." John Fitzgerald Kennedy

These inspiring and well-founded words of our late President were expressed in March 1961. They epitomize the greatness of Taras Shevchenko and the immortality of his work, not only for the people of Ukraine but for humanity at large. The historical heritage, of which the poet's accomplishments are indeed a noble part, is the precious heritage of freedom, of man's relentless fight for personal liberty and national independence. In this struggle for world history the people of the United States hail Shevchenko both as a cultural giant and one of Europe's earliest freedom fighters against the dark and barbaric forces of traditional Russian imperio-colonialism which today is masked in a variety of forms, including statues. In Canada, preparations had already been under way for a national monument which was unveiled in Winnipeg in July 1961, the year of the Shevchenko centennial. On the national level in the United States this idea of a statue had to be integrated into a broader idea of national recognition and purpose that would poignantly project the universal values and functional symbolism of Shevchenko.

It was with this comprehensive idea in mind that this writer authored a laconic and straightforward, amendment to the House Joint Resolution 184 ("House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960", the names of all legislators who were present at the House hearing and who signed the final resolution are listed. Among them were the then Speaker of the House, the Honorable John H. McCormack of Massachusetts and also Representative James O'Kane of Wisconsin, Senator from Texas and the majority leader.

It took another 2 months before the Senate passed the measure. The national congressmen, under the leadership of the Honorable John Lesinski, of Michigan, introduced House Resolution 324, calling for the official publication of the House Joint Resolution 311. Two months later, on June 1, the House Administration Committee approved both House Joint Resolution 311 and House Resolution 324 and ordered favorable reports on both to the House of Representatives. The authorization for the biography was passed, first and on June 24 the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without any objection. In the foreword of the documentary biography, "Europe's Freedom Prophet: Taras Shevchenko 1814-61" (House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960), the names of all legislators who were present at the House hearing and who signed the final resolution are listed. Among them were the then Speaker of the House, the Honorable John H. McCormack of Massachusetts and also Representative James O'Kane of Wisconsin, Senator from Texas and the majority leader.

It took another 2 months before the Senate passed the measure. The national congressmen, under the leadership of the Honorable John Lesinski, of Michigan, introduced House Resolution 324, calling for the official publication of the House Joint Resolution 311. Two months later, on June 1, the House Administration Committee approved both House Joint Resolution 311 and House Resolution 324 and ordered favorable reports on both to the House of Representatives. The authorization for the biography was passed, first and on June 24 the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without any objection. In the foreword of the documentary biography, "Europe's Freedom Prophet: Taras Shevchenko 1814-61" (House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960), the names of all legislators who were present at the House hearing and who signed the final resolution are listed. Among them were the then Speaker of the House, the Honorable John H. McCormack of Massachusetts and also Representative James O'Kane of Wisconsin, Senator from Texas and the majority leader.

It took another 2 months before the Senate passed the measure. The national congressmen, under the leadership of the Honorable John Lesinski, of Michigan, introduced House Resolution 324, calling for the official publication of the House Joint Resolution 311. Two months later, on June 1, the House Administration Committee approved both House Joint Resolution 311 and House Resolution 324 and ordered favorable reports on both to the House of Representatives. The authorization for the biography was passed, first and on June 24 the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without any objection. In the foreword of the documentary biography, "Europe's Freedom Prophet: Taras Shevchenko 1814-61" (House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960), the names of all legislators who were present at the House hearing and who signed the final resolution are listed. Among them were the then Speaker of the House, the Honorable John H. McCormack of Massachusetts and also Representative James O'Kane of Wisconsin, Senator from Texas and the majority leader.

It took another 2 months before the Senate passed the measure. The national congressmen, under the leadership of the Honorable John Lesinski, of Michigan, introduced House Resolution 324, calling for the official publication of the House Joint Resolution 311. Two months later, on June 1, the House Administration Committee approved both House Joint Resolution 311 and House Resolution 324 and ordered favorable reports on both to the House of Representatives. The authorization for the biography was passed, first and on June 24 the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without any objection. In the foreword of the documentary biography, "Europe's Freedom Prophet: Taras Shevchenko 1814-61" (House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960), the names of all legislators who were present at the House hearing and who signed the final resolution are listed. Among them were the then Speaker of the House, the Honorable John H. McCormack of Massachusetts and also Representative James O'Kane of Wisconsin, Senator from Texas and the majority leader.
of the measure. Thus, on August 29 the Senate unanimously passed the House Joint Resolution 311, and 2 days later, on August 31, the Senate voted for it without objection.

On September 8, President Johnson signed the resolution into law on September 13, 1960. On the basis of this law, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America immediately proceeded to establish the Shevchenko Memorial Committee which would devote itself exclusively to plans and operations aimed at the building of the statue. Furthermore, the law precipitated considerable discussion here and abroad. Although there were various opinions as to the course of its passage through Congress, the law now became an object of deep and curious interest to our press. Loquacious articles and editorials appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, the Chicago Sunday Tribune, the Pittsburgh Family Magazine, and numerous other organs in the country. The Shevchenko symbolism had caught on.

The reaction from the Soviet Union was what one would expect. The Soviet Government spoiled the propaganda plans of colonialist Moscow and captive Kiev, who were interested in having the statue as a mere social reformer, a democratic revolutionary, and a precursor of the October Russian Revolution. The purity of a national hero who was not polluted with familiar contaminative elements of Russian propaganda; the national heroerosm of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, realists, and many other publications. Taking both the Congress' action and the Shevchenko memorial resolution, the evidence on how to pulverize Soviet Russian psychopolitical maneuvers is indeed overwhelming.

Once the law came into being, the rest was a technical implementation of the intent and purpose. As early as 1964, the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, under the able administration of its executive director, Mr. Joseph Leasawy, launched plans for the building of the statue. In the span of a year and a half, over a quarter of a million dollars were collected for the project. This was a Spartan feat by American sculptors, architects, and artists whom the Committee was able to select. The project as recommended by the Department of the Interior and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee.

Interestingly, the minds of the statue's sponsors has been the community about the Shevchenko site. From the very start, priority was given to criteria of beauty, restriuc­ tion, and utility. The statue and its surrounding architecture may well be viewed as an enhancement of the already existing quality of the site. The Shevchenko Park is, in truth, a park of freedom and culture.

The Meaning of Shevchenko to America

In a way it is no accident that this monu­ ment—freedom. We all know and treasure our country's own symbols and their courageous search for liberty, freedom, and genuine human happiness. With greatness of soul, rectitude of will, and intellectual acumen, the representatives of this powerful Nation of ours, significantly, and as though by act of providence, decided to honor the Ukrainian poet of the Church of the Pilgrims, both symbolically radiating these ultimate and highest attributes of our temporal existence.

In his address on May 24, 1964, at the dedication of the George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Va., President Johnson declared: "Thus will be bridges across the gulf which has divided us from eastern Europe. They will be bridges of influence and goodwill in the name of humanitarian aid." It will require more than these bridges to defeat and eliminate the menace of Soviet Russian imperialcolonia­ lism. However, in the case of the Shevchenko symbolism, Shevchenko fits the President's prescription perfectly as a bridge into Eastern Europe, as a bridge into our future relations with the Soviet Russian Empire, which in its primary form mas­ quis has also been obliterated.

Contrary to popular impressions, the erection of Shevchenko's statue in Washington is not the end, the omega, of American effort to broaden and deepen our outlook toward the Soviet Russian Empire. It is only the beginning, the alpha, of such concentrated effort. The monument does not point to the present, but to the future. It is a bridge to the future, a bridge to the future. It points primarily and exclusively to the future.

The whole significance of the Shevchenko statue is futural. Through all that it symbolizes—the continuum of freedom, long-suffering, spiritual affinity with our own revolution, tradition of freedom that rebelled against anti-Semitism, serfdom, Russian institutional barbarism, and the degra­ dation of women, and the powerful idea of national independence and self-determina­ tion of peoples—the statue will be a beacon for the freedom loving nations of all other free nations in the world. And that cause is the U.S.S.R. Through Shevchenko millions will deepen their resolve for freedom in their own lands. The Russian nation in Europe, Ukraine itself, and by this knowledge their appreciative awareness of all other captive nations in the U.S.S.R. will be intensified.

Not only will this bridge to the future serve this prime educational purpose, it will also guide us functionally in an unwavering concentration on the root cause of all the major problems bearing on war and peace in the world. The root cause is Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, Western Europe, politically and interminably functioning behind the deceptive mask of world communism. Those who grasped the true meaning of Shevchenko—symbolism of Shevchenko point to the most important of these problems, which are related to the Washington Monument inscribed with the historic message, with the historic message of all the people of all the nations of the world, for all ages, that freedom is not the end, the omega, of American revolution, but the beginning, the alpha, of such concentrated effort, one that will be intensified.

The summit of cynicism was reached in the Kremlin this past March when the Russian dictator Khrushchev received a medal of Washington on Hitler. This fact in itself concretely conveys the symbolism of Shevchenko, the heart of the Russian prison house of about 20 million captives, who have been twisted to suit their propaganda purposes.
Shevchenko's statue in Washington mirrors with resplendent effect such lies and distortions on the part of colonialist Moscow and its Stalinist Brown Shirts. It is a monument of truth and a beacon of strength and enlightenment for American cold war victory over the reactionary forces of tradition and superstition. It seeks to legitimize itself under the ideological cover of communism and under the pretense of participation in the spirit of reconstruction for all people.

My colleague Dr. Roman Smal-Stoocki, of Marquette University, has written a fascinating book "Shevchenko Meets America" (Milwaukee, Wis., 1964). For background material it should be read by all. It goes a long way to explain why on June 27, 1964, finally, America and Ukraine, despite this date the two will never part as the global plagues diffuse the power of freedom in the remaining empires in the world.

UKRAINE: HISTORY AND PRESENT STATUS

IN BRIEF

Area: 289,000 square miles (larger than Poland and Yugoslavia combined).

Population: 41,500,000.

Location: A Republic in the U.S.S.R., bordering on Hungary, Rumania, Poland, the Black and Caspian Seas. At 1914, the Ukrainian population was 16,000,000.

Periods of Independence: 9th to 13th century; 17th century up to 1684; 1917-21. Ukraine today is nominally an independent state by organizing the Ukrainian national government and its armies and imposed a Communist puppet régime upon the country. In 1938, Ukraine was brigaded with Ukraine and Georgia as one of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But control over foreign affairs and most domestic matters was continued by the Soviet Government of Moscow, which was, in effect, the government of Russia.

PRESENT STATUS OF UKRAINE

The present status of Ukraine is that of a Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian S.S.R. It is one of 10 constituent republics of the Soviet Union, and also a charter member of the United Nations. Theoretically, Ukraine is an independent country, with a separate Ukrainian government in Kiev. The separate Ukrainian Constitution assures the country the rights of secession from the U.S.S.R. as does also the Soviet Constitution.

On April 11, 1923, the government of the Ukrainian S.S.R. was reorganized by the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, a pseudoparliament. The following ministries were designated: Education, Public Health, Agriculture, Communications, Construction, Public Roads and Highways, Construction, Commercial Enterprises, Assembly and Special Construction, Education, Public Security, Social Security, Communications.

Only the defense ministry and internal security affairs (Soviet police) are in the hands of the central Soviet (Russian) Government. In addition to the minister of finance, there is no separate Ukrainian national currency, just as there is no separate Ukrainian communication system.

The legislative power of Ukraine is concentrated in the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine in Kiev, which is a replica of the central Soviet in Moscow. There is only one legal party, the Communist Party of Ukraine. This latter is a branch of the All-Union Communist Party. No opposition candidates to the Supreme Soviet must have the endorsement of the Communist Party, which in turn takes orders from the Russian Communist Party and its emissaries in Ukraine.

The strength and numbers of the Communist Party of Ukraine is not well known, but it is evident that many Secret Police (KGB) or insufficiently committed members. However, the number is estimated as close to 900,000. From the time of the establishment of the Soviet Union in 1923 all top level Communist leadership in Ukraine has been non-Ukrainian. After the death of Stalin in 1953 and the rise to power of Khrushchev, a more liberal program was introduced in Ukraine to the extent that the Ukrainian Communist Party of Ukraine was now a Ukrainian, Alexander Kirichenko. He in turn was succeeded by another Ukrainian, Mykola Podhorny, and the latter was replaced by a third one, Petro Y. Shelest.

Despite these outward Ukrainian trappings the Communist Party of Ukraine in is essence a Russian power, based on domination of the Ukrainian people.

In general, the Soviet power in Ukraine, including in the post-Stalin period, is characterized by the following:

1. Russification: Aimed at Russifying the Ukrainian people and, at the very minimum, "common Soviet man and language";

2. Drive against Ukrainian nationalism: This has included periodic attacks on Ukrainian independent culture, and on other manifestations which are in consonance with the Ukrainian national aspirations for freedom and independent statehood;

3. Economic exploitation: Ukrainian natural resources, such as wheat, and the products of Ukrainian mines and machine-building industries, have been taken from Ukraine. Much has been sent to Cuba, Egypt, and China, and the Soviet objectives to encourage the U.S. to support the spread of this kind of activity.

4. Military occupation: Ukrainians have been victimized by every Soviet régime. The methods employed include manmade famine, forcible deportations to labor camps, political and "liquidation of enemies of the people.

5. Internal corruption: Ukrainians have been victimized and oppressed by every Soviet régime. The methods employed include manmade famine, forcible deportations to labor camps, political and "liquidation of enemies of the people.

The sensitivity of Kremlin leaders over Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations enslaved by Communist Russia was well demonstrated during the deliberations in June 1964 at the adoption of the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" by the U.S. Congress. Thereupon, the Kremlin leaders, most notably Brezhnev, boldly proclaimed that Ukraine was a "free and sovereign country" and needed no help from "American imperialists.

Ukraine is the last surviving non-Russian captive nations in the slave empire of Moscow. Without Ukraine, with its geopolitical and cultural significance, the communist Russian imperialist Russia could not have become a threat to the free world. Without Ukraine, Communist Russia would not be the threat to the free world that it is today.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEMORIAL STATUE TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, UKRAINE AND FIGHTER FOR HUMAN LIBERTY

Taras Shevchenko embodied in his poetry the "holy ideas" of Ukraine, just as the American Declaration of Independence, and the words of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln embody the highest principles and aspirations of America.

Ukrainians were human liberty and national independence. Shevchenko expressed the close tie between America and Ukraine over 100 years ago by calling for freedom for everyone: "The project of freedom is the birthright of the human race, promoting his new and righteous law."

The Statue of Liberty in New York harbor stands as a timeless symbol of freedom for everyone entering the United States. The Memorial Statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., will stand as a constant reminder of man's struggle for freedom in east-central Europe and around the world.

THE WORLD STRUGGLE OF FREEDOM VERSUS Tyranny

Today, the United States and Soviet Russia are engaged in a struggle against the aggression of Taras Shevchenko, whose 150th birthday anniversary is being celebrated around the world in 1964. Communist propagandists claim that Shevchenko, having fought against serfdom, was a Bolshevik who died before his time. In the United States and elsewhere, those who oppose tyranny of any kind emphasize that Shevchenko was a leader in man's struggle against tyranny and for human freedom. All have officially sought Ukrainian independence from Moscow. Shevchenko was a true revolutionary for human liberty who, were he alive today, would be a leader in the struggle against totalitarianism and the tyranny of Soviet Russia.

ACTION OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Shevchenko's death, the U.S. Congress...
held hearings on Shevchenko's life and works. These resulted in House Document 445—Taras Shevchenko, Remembrance, which was the passage of a bill authorizing erection of a memorial statue of Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., with the consent of the American Congress. Twenty American artists of Ukrainian descent and origin raised over one-third of a million dollars to cover the cost of the statue.

A committee was then established to determine the statue design. This was won by Leo Mol, who had been born in Ukraine in 1916, had studied in Vienna, Berlin, and Holland, and was twice president of the Sculptors Society of Canada.

The erection of the memorial statue to Tzara Shevchenko belongs to the category of his fight for national independence and freedom of all peoples, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. It is also an expression of American devotion to the cause of independence and freedom everywhere in the world.

In the words of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America: "The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom, in the Soviet Union, for Communism cannot afford to be without freedom."

**AMERICAN LEADERS COMMENT ON SHEVCHENKO**

American leaders of both political parties have praised Tzara Shevchenko as a poet and as a champion of liberty. A few comments follow:

The late President John F. Kennedy: "I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet Tzara Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage."

Senator Thomas J. Dooce, Democrat, of Connecticut: "Tzara Shevchenko belongs in the first instance to the Ukrainian people. But, in a larger sense, he belongs to all mankind. He stands as a forerunner of social-political contributions to Ukraine.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota: "His [Shevchenko's] life and writings are a living challenge to the freedom-loving Ukrainians and other oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe."

Senator Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York: "Tzara Shevchenko was a bard of freedom. It is fitting that the statue of such a national hero, who taught the American ideals of patriotism and service to man, should stand in the Capital of the United States."

Congressman Airin Bentley, Republican, of Michigan: "In authorizing the erection of this memorial to Tzara Shevchenko Congress was paying tribute which is richly deserved, to a recognized champion of human liberty and freedom. We are all familiar with the inspiration which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln and an admiral of George Washington, has given the people of his native Ukraine and freedom-loving peoples everywhere."

Congressman Edward Des迂inski, Republican, of Illinois: "The Ukraine represents the largest offshoot of the Slavic people without a nation within the present boundaries of the Soviet Union, and congressional support of the monument to Shevchenko represents a psychological victory for the Soviet Union in America and its insidious propaganda operation."

Congressman Thaddeus Dulski, Democrat, of New York: "The coming Shevchenko statue will in every respect be a statue symbolizing world freedom. This is the most important aspect of the Shevchenko project. Shevchenko keynotes world freedom, and the memorial in Washington, D.C., is for the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself."

Congressman Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio: "Tzara Shevchenko was a unique champion of freedom for all men and for all nations, just as he was the avowed enemy of tyranny, despotism, and imperialism."

Congressman Daniel Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania: "When Shevchenko's monument to world freedom will be unveiled next month in Washington, it will be dedicated to all Americans who, like the late President, have with knowledge and perception seen for the first time in history the Tzara Shevchenko for world freedom. Indeed, the statue will honor the understanding and vision of our late President."

Congressman John Lekinski, Democrat, of Michigan: "Tzara Shevchenko was distinguished as a man of letters, an eminent poet, a giant of the stage, a fervent patriot of unblemished character. But more than that, he was a voice crying for freedom from the dark depths of slavery and serfdom. During his lifetime, Shevchenko was so severely oppressed by the czarist regime as they are today under the Russian communist in the Soviet Union, as 45 million Ukrainians enslaved by the Russian Commissars unceasingly to obtain their freedom, they look to Tzara Shevchenko as the hope of liberty and as a source of inspiration and incentive from his life and works."

**FROM UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL**

(All rights reserved)

**WASHINGTON, June 20.**—Controversy can take many strange shapes. Next week, for example, it will be recognized, weigh 3 tons, and be composed of pure bronze.

The controversy in this instance is a statue—a sculptured replica of Tzara Shevchenko, Ukraine's 19th century hero and poet laureate of Ukraine. It is scheduled to be unveiled here next Saturday, with post-communist Ukraine. It is scheduled to be unveiled here next Saturday, with post-communist Ukraine.

The bard is hailed by his American anti-Communist sponsors as "Europe's freedom fighter." Ironically, however, he received equal commendation in the Soviet Union as a forerunner of modern bolshevism. And with both groups claiming Shevchenko as their hero, the statue, as developed between Moscow and Washington.

The Soviet press is expected to react bitterly to the unveiling ceremonies. There will be no part in such a deal. Nevertheless, the USSR, Moscow's English-language publication distributed in this country, is reviewing this month an article in favor of Shevchenko's legacy to the modern Soviet Union. And Soviet Premier Nikita Krushchev was given the Shevchenko award from the Ukrainian Government for his outstanding social-political contributions to Ukraine.

As the date for the statue's unveiling drew near, the chairman of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, The Washington Post printed a series of editorials questioning Shevchenko's literary merits and his importance to Americans.

The National Capital Planning Commission, which must approve planned statue sites, was asked by the sponsors to change the site study plans for the memorial. But a review of the project produced no grounds for delaying the unveiling.

One of the more humorous offshoots of the controversy centered recently on a proposal in Trenton, New Jersey's Hamilton Township to change the name of a suburban street to Shevchenko Boulevard. The suggestion was greeted with deadening silence by angry residents who complained they could not spell or pronounce the name.

Just who was Shevchenko? Was he a Bolsheviek or a Ukrainian George Washington? Actually he was a sera, a poet, a painter, a humanist, a contemporary and admirer of Abraham Lincoln, a friend of the noted American Negro actor, Ira Aldridge, and an admired singer of the Negro spirituals.

During the past 50 years, his many volumes have been translated into some 400 times into 51 languages, and the rich emotional content of his works, in foreign languages, have been distributed, while Ukrainian copies of his poems exceed 7 million.

Washington, June 29—Tzara Shevchenko's freedom was purchased by a St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) painter in 1838. His paintings and poems soon gained prominence. By the time of his death, the 47-year-old poet had..."
American intelligentsia, Shevchenko was enthusiastic about western democracy, abolition of serfdom, and an end to the czarist autocracy and sought to promote the idea of Ukraine independence. For his activities in a secret Ukrainian nationalist party, he was arrested in 1849. In 1857, Shevchenko was arrested and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment and exile. Pardoned in 1857, he managed to make a journey back to his homeland before dying in 1861.

Of his 47 years, he lived 24 in serfdom, 10 in exile, 3 under Russian police supervision, and only 10 years free. He is best remembered for these lines from his poem “God’s Fool”:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe

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

AMERICA MEETS SHEVCHENKO
(Lev E. Dobriansky)

June 27, 1994, the day of the unveiling of the statue of the poet-romancer, Taras Shevchenko, in the United States Capitol, can truly be accepted as the day America meets Shevchenko. In response to an act of Congress, this towering symbol of freedom now stands permanently in the Capital of our Nation in a clear and public declaration of America’s understanding and support of their supreme goals of national independence and freedom. America meets Shevchenko and as the House passed House resolution 54, which again threatened the success of the entire project. Happily, as though by some magic, Congress went into recess to accommodate the two political conventions, and time was gained to convince the Senate Rules Committee on the merits of House Joint Resolution 311. The documentary biography, prepared by the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation, was published and proved to be a valuable and instructive medium. On August 29, the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House Joint Resolution 311, and on August 31 the full Senate passed the measure.

With the signing of House Joint Resolution 54, on September 13, 1960, the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America was completely crossed to America meeting Shevchenko.

Thus, then, the Ukrainian Congressional Committee of America established the Shevchenko Memorial Committee to implement the act of Congress and to bring the statue itself into concrete reality. Later attacks against the statue by two well-situated individuals were successfully met largely by the combined efforts of the Ukrainians in the United States. Briefly, then, in formal glory America meets Shevchenko on June 27, 1994, but in reality America meets Shevchenko as far back as 1960.

In full conformity with the theme and character of this short history of the monument, the statue is rightly dedicated to the Cause of Freedom, and independence of all the captive nations. In grandeur of perspective of the immense work that lies ahead, it is not unimportant to mention the ideas and ideals which Shevchenko as a freedom fighter fought for and died for.

Forlorn, the statue of Shevchenko and his works in our time is the liberation and national freedom not only of Ukraine but of all the captive non-Russian nations both inside and outside the Soviet Union and this means against Soviet Russian imperial-colonialism, the communist conspiracy, and the other threats to national freedom.

It is any wonder that America, the home of the free, has met and warmly embraced Shevchenko?

MEMORIAL TO A GREAT FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

A memorial statue will be unveiled and dedicated in Washington, D.C. on June 27 to commemorate a great freedom fighter for freedom and stand as a constant reminder of captive peoples’ struggle for freedom.

Former President Harry S. Truman is honorary chairman for the event. The National Sponsorship Committee includes such outstanding national leaders as His Excellency Patrick O’Boyle, Archbishop of Washington; Dr. Daniel A. Polling, editor of Christian Herald; Edmund G. Gillette, national commander, American Legion; Dr. Roy B. Lejins, president, American Latvian Association; and Richard M. Nixon; Dr. Peter Lejins, president of the American Latvian Association; and Mr. and Mrs. Henry L. Lefler.

The memorial statue will honor a 19th century Ukrainian poet and fighter for freedom, Taras Shevchenko. Shevchenko was a great freedom fighter and committed himself to the cause of freedom, and championed the cause of freedom and national independence for all peoples. He called for independence for Ukraine as early as 1840 and signed the famous letter called for Independence for the colonies. Knowing of the American Revolution, he was delighted with the country of Washington with “his new and righteous law.”

INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF EVENT

The unveiling and dedication is an international event of great importance. This is
the 150th anniversary year of Shevchenko's birth, and is being celebrated around the world. Russian Communists are trying to claim Shevchenko as one of their own, a prodigy in America. American-Ukrainians clamored for an assemblage which would speak out for ominously threatened Ukraine and for the menaced free world.

The first Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) was held in Washington, D.C., May 30, 1939. The身材 foreign policy, denounced totalitarian aggression, and appealed for help toward Ukrainian liberation from Russian Communist rule.

In succeeding years, UCCA instituted the publication, the Ukrainian Quarterly, urged acceptance of the Irish Republic's first Irish army which was waging underground war against Soviet Russia, and appealed for universal replication of the four freedoms and Atlantic Charter principles to Ukraine and all enslaved nations.

The fourth UCCA Congress, Washington, D.C., November 1949, was warmly greeted by President Harry S. Truman. At this time the Voice of America announced that it would relay the broadcasts of the new underground radio in its overseas broadcasts. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, was elected president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

President Truman sent a message to the Fifth UCCA Congress in July 1953 urging Ukrainian-Americans to assist Ukraine's efforts to cast off the yoke of Soviet in the world.

Another 100,000, approximately, entered the United States from displaced persons camps in Europe after World War II. Today, more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent or origin are embraced by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

LOCATION OF UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS

Ukrainians who came to the United States in 1890-1914 settled in industrial areas—the coal mining areas of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Illinois; the iron mining regions of Minnesota and Michigan; the gold and silver districts of Montana and Colorado; the farm States of Nebraska and the Dakotas.

Some settled in metropolitan areas of New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Chicago. Some went west to California, Oregon, and Washington. A few went to Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS

The incoming Ukrainians formed a number of fraternal organizations to provide protection and social services. Of these, the most numerous and first appeared in 1894 appeared the first and largest of these, the Ukrainian National Association. Others followed, including the Catholic Workingmen's Association, the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics, and the Ukrainian National Aid Association.

Each published a Ukrainian-language newspaper. The earliest is Svodoba, established in 1893 and published by the Ukrainian National Association. The daily America, published by the same association while the Workingmen's and National Aid Associations publish weeklies, Narodna VoLy and Ukrainska Narodne Slovo, respectively.

Each published a Ukrainian-language newspaper. The earliest is Svodoba, established in 1893 and published by the Ukrainian National Association. The daily America, published by the same association while the Workingmen's and National Aid Associations publish weeklies, Narodna VoLy and Ukrainska Narodne Slovo, respectively.

The first Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Congress was held in Washington, D.C., May 30, 1939. It was eagerly greeted by President Harry S. Truman. At this time the Voice of America announced that it would relay the broadcasts of the new underground radio in its overseas broadcasts. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, was elected president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

President Truman sent a message to the Fifth UCCA Congress in July 1953 urging Ukrainian-Americans to assist Ukraine's efforts to cast off the yoke of Soviet in the world.

Another 100,000, approximately, entered the United States from displaced persons camps in Europe after World War II. Today, more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent or origin are embraced by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
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fuses to give the Communists their way is “imperialistic,” and protection of a country the Russians impose is “imperialism.”

Even more confusing, perhaps, is the Soviet claim that an American working class functioned in 1914 and 1917 as a “human dynamo mobile, good clothes and well-rounded diet, is “exploited by capitalists,” while its Red control of the press, that “is the result of everything, are better off in every way.”

“The facts of the matter are,” as President Kennedy reported after his Vienna meeting with Premier Khrushchev, “that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: War, peace, democracy, and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong.”

NEW SOVIET “HERO”

Now, for reasons that only the up-to-date journalist can imagine, the Soviets are hailing as a hero a 19th-century genius who would have been their natural enemy and are lambasting the United States for recognizing his greatness as a poet, an artist, and a fighter for human liberty.

Taras Shevchenko lived only 9 of his 47 years as a freeman. From his birth in 1814 until he was 24 years old, he was a serf. After Premier Khmelnytsky had been bought, he spent 10 years in exile, and 3½ years under Russian police supervision. But in the brief time given to him he wrote so many poems that he was sold as a serf against serfdom that he is still acclaimed, 103 years after his death, not only as the greatest of Ukrainian poets but as “Europe’s Freedom Fighter.”

In 1842, Canadians of Ukrainian descent erected a statue of Shevchenko in Winnipeg, Ontario. And next Saturday (June 27) another statue of him will be unveiled (at 22d and P Sts., NW) in Washington. It is the work of the Ukrainian-born Canadian sculptor, Leo Mol, and it stands on land made available by Congress for “A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of all Captive Nations.”

To appreciate Shevchenko’s greatness, one must know something of the history of his native Ukraine. Because Nikita Khrouchev is the natural enemy and are lambasting the United States for recognizing his greatness as a poet, an artist, and a fighter for human liberty.

Shevchenko had been writing poetry for some time, but his poems did not begin to attract attention until after his arrest and his family’s claim to his freedom was set free. Then they attracted so much attention that, when he was arrested with other organizers of a movement to create a republican government for all the Slavic peoples, Czar Nicholas I added a special dictum to his sentence.

The sentence made Shevchenko a private in the army serving on the distant Asian border, and the czar added that the young artist-poet be kept “under the strictest supervision with the prohibition of writing and drawing.”

After the death of Nicholas I, Count and Countess Pederod Poltorak-Tolstoy persuaded the new czar, Alexander II, to pardon Shevchenko. He continued writing and working in the cause of freedom, but he did not live to see his dreams come true. On January 20, 1861, the day after his 47th birthday and on the eve of Czar Alexander II’s liberation of the serfs, he died.

Yet he lives on today, more than a century later. His beloved Ukraine is still enslaved by the Russians, but they have claimed him as their own. The Soviet government recently moved the huge iron cross from his grave at Kaniv, on the bank of the Dnieper River, and replaced it with a tall obelisk monument—thus, as Roman Smol-Stockey has pointed out in his “Shevchenko meets America,” “directing its propaganda to a systematic re-education of the idea that Shevchenko works and the ideals which burned within them.”

ARMED AMERICA

To the free world, Shevchenko was a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny and sought national Ukrainian independence from Russian dominance. After his death, his many writings against the Soviet Union’s independence and for the American form of government in these lines:

“Ah, you miserable And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last? When shall we get ourselves a Washington To promulgate his new and righteous law? But some day we shall surely find the man.”

But in Moscow and Kiev, Soviet propagandists have been trying to prove that Shevchenko, having been a leader in the struggle against Russian occupation, was thus a Bolshevik born before his time.

They have carried on a bitter and inces­

sional attack against the Washington memo­

rional to Shevchenko because it promotes the independence of Ukraine from Russian over­

suppression of the new government. This took

Throughout the long years of their enslavement, the Ukrainian people’s longing for independence was fanned by the writings of their patriots. But Shevchenko, more than any other, expressed the yearnings of the people and their utter contempt for their oppressors.

Shevchenko had every reason to be bitter. He was born into serfdom on the estate of a nobleman near Kyiv, and he was the son of his mother died when he was 9, and his father when he was 12. To be either an orphan or a serf was bad, but to be both was almost unbearable.

After pasturing cattle and working in the bakery, for neither of which he showed any talent, he was assigned to the baronial man­

sion as a page. This at least provided an opportunity to study the many beautiful paintings that it contained, but when he was caught trying to remove one, he was flogged.

FREEDOM BOUGHT

When the rebellions failed to kill his love of art, his master apprenticed him to a painter in St. Petersburg. There he met Karl Lior, the greatest portrait painter of the day. Bryulov bought Shevchenko’s freedom from Engelhardt for 2,000 rubles, and Bryulov also offered to paint a portrait of the Russian poet Zhukovsky.
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Spies of the Spies—New Status of July 2
still rend the air. The familiar and "Loved Lady with the Lamp" is still saluting the World pilgrims in the form of a heroic figure symbolic of liberty enlightening the world. But the impressive sculptured monument that sells New York city.

In Washington, capital of the free world, speaks of freedom from coercive shackles of the body and mind, in the face of misrule, of liberty of conscience, tortured by cruel tyranny and who, in Abraham Lincoln's time, yearned for an emancipator for his enslaved countrymen, the Statue of Liberty is a monument of this new statue of liberty. They stand in protest against the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Among the Ukrainians who have fled from "the Utopia" on the other side of the Iron Curtain has the number of captive nations the estimated number of refugees from communism since World War II is 15,063,000, plus other millions who have been exiled by hunger or terror, and suffering this vast uprooted army speaks with deafening and terrifying voice that the hope of the common man is not Lenin but Lincoln.

And so, brave poet-prophet, even your deadening years in serfdom could not put out the fire in your soul but rather turned your eyes to the emancipating principles of the American Revolution. Tens of thousands acclaiming voices welcome you to America today near the glistening memorials of patriots whose principles and ideals fired your own heart—Washington and Jefferson.

The American Revolution. His name—Taras Shevchenko—who, in the depths of Russian serfdom and thraldom, cried out in desperate hope to God, "Oh, Lend me the strength in the Father of the American Republic would snap the imprisoning chains of Serfdom.

This new and deeply significant Statue of Liberty has been fashioned by authority of Congress in an action signed by the then President Eisenhower, who has declared: "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of the status quo in which we find ourselves. My reputation by symbol and representation of human beings on a gigantic scale."

The new Statue of Liberty is vocal with righteous indignation that burned like fire in the breast of the exiled poet. For a very soul during the years of his enforced exile by the Russian czar from under his Ukrainian skies. His angry protest flamed against his jailors in every language, dripped with Ukrainian blood as it does today. The same sort of atrocities which Shevchenko denounced by the Russian autocracy were being perpetrated then by czarism as they are today by the ruthless policy of the Soviet regime. Who knows more than the Ukrainians in its contemporary colonializing aggression Red Russia is a fero­cious leopard which has not changed its character even during the years of its captivity. As Secretary of State Rusk declares: "The very language of international intercourse has become distorted. Aggression is whatever stands in the way of their world order." That is what makes every one of their embassies and legations a nest of spying and infiltration.

It is no wonder that the Soviets, with their fixed manifestation of complete world domination, rant and rave at the achieve­ments of a man who in his lifetime made a claim with perverted upside-down logic that if living today this apostle of democracy, who then, with Shevchenko, found his cause and aiding and abetting the enslavers. To make Taras Shevchenko a partner of the Kremlin conspiracy is akin to saying that if Lincoln were living today he would fol­

...with Shevchenko in mid-1963 that some of the most virulent and most vicious arguments about Shevchenko's statue. And in the end they have hoped to render these con­ tentions that have been repeated over and over again as some sort of a dog story in the newspapers and the television news programs. The entire and complete story of the so-called Shevchenko statue controversy is systematically laid out in the book "Shevchenko, a Monument to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1964). It is, of course, impos­sible to treat here every specious argument and accusation that was raised in the period of September 1963 to February 1964, nor is the author's purpose to conciliate the argument that was conciliated against the statue and its sponsors, some being of the basest sort, or to be vituperous. Instead, the universalists relied ultimately on two main conten­tions plausible and rationally acceptable.

The extreme to which Wiggins has gone in abusing the facilities of the Washington Post can be seen from correspondence about the announcement of the placement of Shevchenko's statue ("Shevchenko Statue Ready for Unveiling," Washington Post, June 30, 1964) and a report of its realization a week later ("Controversy Statue Placed On Its Pedestal," the Washington Post, June 4, 1964). The pattern of editorial comments...
HOUSE

The controversial statue of Taras Shevchenko, 19th-century Ukrainian poet and national hero, will be unveiled here today. Approximately 100,000 persons from all over the world are expected to attend the ceremony, and thousands of persons, and some 32,000 Ukrainians and descendants of Ukrainians will march in a parade following the unveiling.

The statue, a bronze likeness of the poet, will be unveiled at 10 a.m., at 15th Street and Connecticut Avenue NW.

The parade will encompass the area bounded by Connecticut Avenue, both north and south of 14th Street; both 15th and 16th Streets, both west and east of Connecticut Avenue; and 13th Street, both north and south of Connecticut Avenue. The parade, which will consist of approximately 150 floats and 30 marching bands, will begin at 11 a.m.

The parade route will be closed to vehicular traffic except for some003:

The controversial statue of Taras Shevchenko, 19th-century Ukrainian poet and national hero, will be unveiled here today. Approximately 100,000 persons from all over the world are expected to attend the ceremony, and thousands of persons, and some 32,000 Ukrainians and descendants of Ukrainians will march in a parade following the unveiling.

The statue, a bronze likeness of the poet, will be unveiled at 10 a.m., at 15th Street and Connecticut Avenue NW.

The parade will encompass the area bounded by Connecticut Avenue, both north and south of 14th Street; both 15th and 16th Streets, both west and east of Connecticut Avenue; and 13th Street, both north and south of Connecticut Avenue. The parade, which will consist of approximately 150 floats and 30 marching bands, will begin at 11 a.m.

The parade route will be closed to vehicular traffic except for some vehicles which will be permitted to cross police lines. The area will be permitted to cross police lines if they indicate their intentions by turning on their headlights. Once the parade route is clear, however, the vehicles will be permitted on or across it.

Shevchenko was born a serf, gained his freedom at the age of 24 and went on to become his country's greatest poet. He died in 1861 at the age of 47. Moscow represents him as a forerunner of modern communism,
while his anti-Communist sponsees here in­
sist he was an original "European freedom­
fighter.

PARADE AND DEDICATION HERE TO HONOR
UKRAINIAN POET
(21x68) (By Robert J. Lewis)

Today is Taras Shevchenko Day in Wash­
ington, D.C. Several thousand patriotic de­
vottees of the Nation's 2 million liberty­loving Americans of Ukrainian origin have arranged an impres­
sive showing of pride in their 19th century

An estimated 50,000 Ukrainian Americans and others from Canada and countries abroad, including several leaders of last night and today for a parade and dedication of the Shevchenko statue authorized by Congress

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is scheduled to deliver the principal address and unveil the $250,000 monument to the Ukrainian people's foremost prophet of freedom.

LAW SIGNED IN 1960

The law authorizing construction of the statue was signed by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1960. It is located on a triangular site at 23rd and

The monument site was to be sure of having a place to see the dedication ceremonies.

Many thousands of Khaki-clad youngsters who had come from other youth groups were in the parade's line of march. Among musical groups and bands were the Royal Sabers of George Washington University, the Oxford Elitas said eight bands were to be in the parade.

SEVERAL TREATED

By parade time, a Red Cross first aid station at the south end of the Ellipse reported a few persons had been treated for blisters and fainting.

The influx of participants and spectators for the ceremonies was arranged for by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of Amer­
ica, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Ukrainian National Association, and others.

The 14-foot-high sculted figure of the poet surmounts a 7-foot polished granite base in the quarter-acre landscaped park adjacent to the Episcopal Church of the Pilgrims.

The site authorized by Congress was selected by a Ukrainian group and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. All funds for the monument were raised in voluntary contributions by Ukrainian-American groups.

Opening event of the gala celebration, formally marking official recognition of the Ukrainian poet laureate in the Nation's cap­i
tal, was a Constitution Hall concert last night. More than 1,800 persons from delegations arriving early, as well as others, were present for the program by Ukrainian in­
strumentalists conducted by John Zado­
rony.

Besides the parade and dedication, today was to be crowned with events, ending with a banquet for an estimated 3,500 per­
sons at the District National Guard Armory at 8:30 a.m. tomorrow. The placing of wreaths on the grave of the late

President John F. Kennedy and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cem­
etary, by the Ukrainian-American veterans' organization.

Principal speaker at tonight's armory ban­
quet, at which the Freedom Awards are to be presented, will be Senator Morton, Republican of Kentucky. Honorary chairman of the sponsoring committee for today's celebration is former President Harry S. Truman, who has been chosen to receive one of the Freedom Awards.

OPENING ADDRESS, TARAS SHEVCHENKO MONU­MENT COMMITTEE MEMORIAL, 1964

(21x75) (By Prof. Roman Smalto-Stokl, chairman, Shevchenko Memorial Committee)
The Shevchenko Memorial Committee ex­
tends to all of you, our fellow Americans, our friends from other lands near and far, our warmest welcome and cordial thanks for honoring us with your presence at this historic event in our Nation's Cap­i
tal.

To the great soldier, President Dwight El­
enhower, who signed into law the House joint resolution on the Shevchenko Memorial, and to the large delegation from Canada, headed by the Ukrainian poet, Eugeni Kirillik (his name would seem to indicate his Ukrainian origin—W. 1. B. in the U.S.S.R. magazine (January 1961).

"The peoples of the Soviet Union, and with them all progressive mankind, are getting ready to erect a majestic and immor­
tal memorial of the genius lover of freedom

** ** But our enemies are not asleep.

The American imperialists, relying on those dopey doctrines ** ** * the Ukrainian na­
tionalists ** ** are planning to take advantage of the 100th anniversary for the mon­
ument's dedication as an opportunity of sandering the homeland of Shevchenko, So­

viet Ukraine, and our people, with a flood of anti-Soviet insults, provocations, hoods and distortions.

The nationalist scribes, of the breed of Zaitsev, Donto, and Dobriansky, are displaying an extraordinary audacity in the matter of falsifying Shevchenko and the blasphemous distortions of his works, attempting to present our great poet as some kind of advocate of the modern American imperialist.*

Only a few weeks ago Literature Ukraina, which is the official organ of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, had printed a series of articles attacking the Soviet "expert" on Shevchenko, Mykhailo Novikor, who assailed Prof. Clarence A. Mann­
ing for his article on "Religion of Shevchenko," which appeared in House Document 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Taras Shev­
chenko, 1814-61" (cf. Literaturna Ukraina, March 19, 1964). Prof. Dmytro Pavlychko (March 9, 1964) had assailed a number of articles attacking the Shevchenko project, which was undertaken by the Ukrainian American veterans' organizations and the specially established body, the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America.

A grandiose and historic manifestation ever under­
taken by the Ukrainian emigration in this country, let us review briefly the underlying reasons for this event. We are to honor and venerate Taras Shevchenko.

The Soviet Russians, under whose pre­decessors, have fully grasped and undertaken the powerful meaning and significance of Taras Shevchenko among the Ukrainian people. They could neither deni­
Taking all this into consideration, one is puzzled at the new outburst of the Washington Post, which, it is recalled, last fall began a raucous campaign against the Shevchenko monument in Washington and against the Ukrainians as a whole. When the Shevchenko statue was brought to Washington on June 2, 1955, the Post again dramatized its unfairness and anti-Ukrainian bias, even though the two photographs of the Shevchenko monument it printed a caption, stating that the "controversial statue" was already set up, and that the project was assailed by "Idolizers of Commissars and anti-Semites." One is prone to wonder, who are the "experts," or who is the Washington Post such utter nonsense?

In any event, the overwhelming majority of the American people, and their leaders were not and are not now of the opinion that Shevchenko was not worthy of the honor bestowed on him by the erection of a monument in his memory and honor. Moreover, in connection with the forthcoming unveiling of the monument, a special Shevchenko Memorial Committee and an Honorary Sponsoring Committee was established, of which all Ukrainian political, cultural, and civic leaders as members. Would they really join such a committee, had they a shred of doubt that Shevchenko was not worthy of their moral support? There was another honorary committee established, of which all Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox churchmen in the free world became honorary members, as well as many representatives of Ukrainian scientific, political, cultural, and other organizations in the free world.

The Shevchenko monument in Washington is not only a great undertaking of the Ukrainian community, it is an act of tremendous international significance. Moscow and its puppets in Kiev tried in every way to sabotage the project, or if possible, nix it before it is successfully terminated. When all these nefarious efforts of Moscow failed to be observable Ukrainian bourgeois leaders, they really join such a committee, had they a shred of doubt that Shevchenko was not worthy of their moral support?

The Shevchenko monument project in Washington was started, but succeeded in joining the line of march. The monument in the Nation's capitol will help "kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men." Such a movement, he said, should be a never-ending one whose aim should be dedicated freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the world.

Standing beneath an umbrella put up to protect him from the sun, the former President observed that the monument in the Nation's Capital would help "kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men." Such a movement, he said, should be a never-ending one whose aim should be dedicated freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the world.

Speaking vigorously, Mr. Eisenhower said the "outpouring of lovers of freedom to salute a Ukrainian hero far exceeds my expec-tations."

In what appeared to be an obvious warning to Soviet Russian and Chinese leaders, the former President said, "We can be sure that this nation will, with its valued allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to foil any ill-advised attempt by dictators who threaten that independent and where the love of freedom lives and blazes."

The former President was surrounded by Ukrainian-American officials, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress and Ukrainian church dignitaries on a platform in front of the Ellipse.

AUTHORIZED IN 1960

The monument and its quarter-acre park were authorized in a 1960 bill enacted by Congress and signed by Mr. Eisenhower while he was President. All funds for erection of the statue and its surrounding park and fountain were raised voluntarily by Americans and Canadians.

Taras Shevchenko, who died more than 100 years ago, is revered as the Ukrainian nation's foremost hero-poet and symbol of freedom.

Ukrainian spectators and participants in the parade and dedication poured into Washington last night and early today by special train, hundreds of chartered buses, planes, and private cars.

WORE NATIVE GARB

Many wore the colorful Ukrainian national costume, which were khaki-clad in uniforms of Ukrainian organizations.

Dozens of cities in the United States and Canada were represented. They said they had traveled all night to arrive in time for the parade. Many were being unloaded along Independence Avenue, at the south edge of the Ellipse, after the parade had started, but succeeded in joining the line of march.

The former Chief of Police W. J. Liverman, who was in charge of traffic, estimated about 35,000 were in the parade and 100,000 jammed the 23d, 24th, and F Streets area, just south of Massachusetts Avenue, during the dedication.

DR. DOBRANSKY SPEAKS

Presiding at the dedication was Dr. Lev E. Dobrany, a Georgetown University professor and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The welcoming address and introduction of former President Eisenhower was delivered by George Kravetz, chancellor of Duquesne University, president of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, which sponsored the dedication.

Other speakers at the dedication included Representative DeWitt, Republican, of Illinois; Representative Dulski, Democrat, of New York; Representative Pehanich, Democrat, of Ohio; and Representative Floc, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dorosh, said the Shevchenko stands as a "symbol of freedom, and against tyranny, for all mankind."

Ukrainians Make Eisenhower Feel "Like I Were Back in Politics."

(Phil Casey)

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower received an enthusiastic welcome at ceremonies for the unveiling of the bronze statue of the 19th century Ukrainian poet Taras Grigoryevich Shevchenko at 23d and F Streets NW, yesterday afternoon.

Thanking the crowd of about 36,000 Ukrainians from this country, Canada, Latin America and Europe, Mr. Eisenhower said: "You make me feel almost like I were back in politics."

The parade began at 10 a.m. at the Ellipse and ended on F Street between 23d and 24th Streets NW., after a march up 15th Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, and 23rd Street NW.

The former President praised Shevchenko's poetry and his fight for freedom, saying the poet "expressed eloquently man's undying determination to fight for freedom and his unquenchable faith in ultimate victory."

He said the statue, a 14-foot figure on a 10-foot base, speaks to "millions of oppressed peoples, today and tomorrow, of their constant encouragement to struggle forever against Communist tyranny, until, one day, final victory is achieved, as it most surely will be."

He warned: "The touchstone of any free society is limited government, which does only those things which the people need and which they cannot do for themselves at all, or cannot do as well."

The parade and ceremonies were a demonstration against communism as well as a tribute to Shevchenko.

Nevertheless, the poet is beloved by Communist and anti-Communist alike, and he has been hailed as a fighter for the ideals of communism and the Ukrainians idolize him as a fighter for freedom from tyranny and the oppression of Communist states.

A high point of the celebration, aside from the former President's appearance, was the rendition of the Ukrainian national anthem, and bugle corps, which swung. There were few spectators for the parade, but those who did turn out applauded that band all along the parade route.

Shevchenko became a Ukrainian hero when he wrote revolutionary verse and was actively involved in efforts to free Ukraine's peoples under a republican form of government. A hero, he won freedom for himself and his country.
Peter Besko, who is well acquainted with the Ukrainian community, said, "I walk in the streets for the city of Toronto. I am a laborer, but I know Shevchenko. Maybe half of them do not know Shevchenko, but they know him as a fighter for freedom, and that is enough."

Another man, down from New York, explained to Shevchenko's love for and knowledge of Shevchenko.

"In the Ukraine," he said, "even the poor people knew. I was young, even the very poor had two books: the Bible and the poems of Shevchenko."

UKRAINIANS HAVE HISTORY OF FREEDOM SEEKING

The Ukrainian-born Americans and Americans of Ukrainian descent who came to Washington yesterday brought to the parade zone freedom-seeking traditions inherited from Cossacks and peasants.

Although the Ukraine has been a Soviet Social Republic since 1920, the Ukrainian-Americans retain a distinctive language, music, and dress—all of which were in abundant evidence yesterday afternoon as the parade moved along 22d and P Streets.

According to Orest Horodyiskyj, a native of the Ukraine and writer for the weekly newspaper, in tributes to the man whose statue they were pleased to see in the Capitol, a million Ukrainian-Americans now live in the United States, and some 40,000 were in Washington yesterday for the statue-unveiling ceremonies.

Horodyiskyj said the main immigration of these people to America was about 80 years ago, and he added, "I initially took jobs as farmers and laborers.

They now are concentrated in the urban centers of the Northeastern United States, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. About 80 percent of them speak Ukrainian, a Slavio tongue, and youngsters could be heard talking in what was, indeed, the native tongue of the man. Standing beside his Scout-uniformed, 15-year-old son under a glaring sun, Horodyiskyj, 45, gave this account of Taras Shevchenko and his meaning to him.

"He began writing poems about the hard life of the Ukrainian peasant and political oppression under the czar. For these poems, and for membership in the inter-Slavic Ukrainian Brotherhood, Shevchenko was put in the czarist army for 10 years. When he tried to escape, he was caught, and his landlord and sent him to St. Petersburg in Russia to an art academy, from which he was graduated with a gold medal. A legend of his life tells how the hard life of the Ukrainian peasant and political oppression under the czar. For these poems, and for membership in the inter-Slavic Ukrainian Brotherhood, Shevchenko was put in the czarist army for 10 years.

"Prym, Charles D., Rustnak was half dragoon, and when his army was caught in a car which he had tried to stop from entering the parade zone. A bus diver tried to chase the determined driver but lost him.

"The 700 policemen were supplied with box lunches of chicken, which this time did not poll any of their free choice. We have successively raised a monument to Taras Shevchenko, and I share with all of you a natural sense of accomplishment. But much remains to be done in freedom's behalf, and I know that we will never rest until the chains of all captives are broken and the last enslaving wall crumbles away.

"Be known to all future generations that on this 27th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, of the independence of the United States, and the establishment of the independent, united, and sovereign Ukrainian National Republic the 14th, when the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson was the 36th President of the United States of America,

When Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky was president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, when Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki was president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society,

When Dr. Alexander Archimovich was president of the Ukrainian Academy of Art and Sciences in the United States,

When all freedom-loving peoples, led by the United States of America, having defeated the imperialist and genocidal forces of totalitarianism and fascism, were engaged in a bitter cold war, pursued relentlessly in spite of temporary periods of seeming relaxation, against an enemy with evil wishes and the threat of Rus-so-Communist imperialism.

On this day the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, unveiled this monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the bard of Ukraine and universal champion of freedom. The statue of the people and descendents of all those other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. Together, we of the various ethnic groups, who know only too well what loss of liberty and freedom can mean, must work against any force that would deprive us of the freedom which we enjoy in this country. Freedom can be lost step by step, so we must all cooperate both at the national and the local levels to protect our individual rights and privileges.

When we then join hands and strive for a better and a stronger America, we will have--till the last captive is free--all the blessings and look forward to the day when the people of all nations will be able to share a life of freedom from oppression."

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL BENET, JUNE 27, 1964

I am gratified that so many of you are paying tribute to a man who in action and in verse proved himself inextricably bound up with the cause of freedom. The life of Taras Shevchenko has very properly become symbolic of a basic wish in all men—the desire to be their own masters. The recipient of the inspiring Shevchenko Memorial Award, I am particularly happy to greet you all of you this evening. I also want to extend a special word of appreciation to the President of the Congress Committee—Dr. Lev Dobriansky—whose excellent advice and wise example I have already to rewarding in my work with the committee.

Exalting this occasion may be, we must continue to pray in our hearts for those who suffer, and for the captive peoples who do not in their national tradition and governments not of their free choice. We have succeeded raising a monument to Taras Shevchenko, and I share with all of you a natural sense of accomplishment. But much remains to be done in freedom's behalf, and I know that we will never rest until the chains of all captives are broken and the last enslaving wall crumbles away.

COMMEMORATIVE SCROLL

"Be known to all future generations that on this 27th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, of the independence of the United States, and the establishment of the independent, united, and sovereign Ukrainian National Republic the 14th, when the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson was the 36th President of the United States of America,

When Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky was president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America,

When Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki was president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society,

When Dr. Alexander Archimovich was president of the Ukrainian Academy of Art and Sciences in the United States,

When all freedom-loving peoples, led by the United States of America, having defeated the imperialist and genocidal forces of totalitarianism and fascism, were engaged in a bitter cold war, pursued relentlessly in spite of temporary periods of seeming relaxation, against an enemy with evil wishes and the threat of Rus-so-Communist imperialism.

On this day the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, unveiled this monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the bard of Ukraine and universal champion of freedom. The statue of the people and descendents of all those other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. Together, we of the various ethnic groups, who know only too well what loss of liberty and freedom can mean, must work against any force that would deprive us of the freedom which we enjoy in this country. Freedom can be lost step by step, so we must all cooperate both at the national and the local levels to protect our individual rights and privileges.

Let us then join hands and strive for a better and a stronger America, we will have--till the last captive is free--all the blessings and look forward to the day when the people of all nations will be able to share a life of freedom from oppression."
central and national organizations from many countries of the free world.

This monument is dedicated to all nations and peoples who, like the Ukrainian people, are engaged in a relentless and uncompromising struggle against Russian communism and all other forms of tyranny and despotism. It is a monument for the保障 of the freedom of all mankind, who under foreign Russian imperialist tyranny and colonial rule appealed for "the new and righteous law of Washing­ton, D.C.

This monument was authorized by the U.S. Public Law 86-749, by the 86th Congress, on September 13, 1960, and signed into law by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States of America, on September 13, 1960. This resolution, as adopted by the United States Congress, is "a memorial to the memory of Taras Shevchenko and all other forms of tyranny and despotism."

This resolution, as adopted by the United States Congress, is "a memorial to the memory of Taras Shevchenko and all other forms of tyranny and despotism."

The memorial was authorized by the 86th Congress of the United States of America on August 31, 1960, and signed into Public Law 86-749 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States of America, on September 13, 1960. This statue was erected by Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and friends.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGIS­LATURES—EDITORIAL COMMENT CONCERNING U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) may add his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke in support of House Joint Resolution 1100. I introduced this resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit a State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. With many others, it is my hope that before we adjourn this year, my resolution—or one similar to it—will be approved by this House.

Many thoughtful citizens share my concern that the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court requiring that both houses of a State legislature be apportioned on the basis of population was not wise. Many thoughtful and concerned citizens feel that the decision represents an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the rights of the several States to conduct their own affairs—within the framework of our republican form of government.

The Keene Evening Sentinel, published in Keene, N.H., in my congressional district, comments on the recent Supreme Court decision in a recent editorial. I commend to my colleagues' attention the measured and perceptive observation of this editorial. The criticism expressed in this editorial is powerful and persuasive. It is especially so because of the fact that the excellent, independent paper has forcefully defended the U.S. Supreme Court in connection with some of its recent controversial rulings. I include at this point in the Record the editorial to which I refer:

Gutwein article: As we have made clear on a number of occasions, we believe seats in both legislative houses must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population.

Since the Court has thus adopted the same principle that we, as a newspaper, have urged, why do we think the Court's decision is so unfortunate?

The reason is very simple: We feel it represents an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the rights of the several States and, to a degree, the rights of the Nation's voters. Basically, the Court's majority argued that under every citizen's vote for a State representative and senator be equal to the vote of every other citizen, then some citizens have been denied "equal representation in both legislative houses must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population."

After all, we shall leave to others arguments about the fine points of the law and turn, instead, to what Walter Lippmann in his Monday column on this page said was the "crucial question."

"It is," he said, "whether the United States (courts) should intervene in cases of apportionment, especially of State legislatures.

Lippmann believes the Court should intervene in these cases in any others, where "there is a major ill for which there is no other remedy" except Federal Court intervention.

There to others arguments about the fine points of the law and turn, instead, to what Walter Lippmann in his Monday column on this page said was the "crucial question."

"It is," he said, "whether the United States (courts) should intervene in cases of apportionment, especially of State legislatures.

Lippmann believes the Court should intervene in these cases in any others, where "there is a major ill for which there is no other remedy" except Federal Court intervention.

There of whether Lippmann is right in this premise, we think it can be argued that in most States there are other remedies available to correct injustices of unequal legislative apportionment.

He points out, correctly, that in many States (and New Hampshire is one of them) legislative seats have been apportioned so as to favor a minority of rural voters over a majority of urban voters. This, he agree, unjust and is a major ill. It will not disappear in New Hampshire and elsewhere, it can be corrected when and if a majority of voters become sufficiently aware to insist through constitutional amendment or legislative action that the injustice be remedied. This might take a long time in a given State, but if the partially disfranchised majority cared enough, we feel sure it could find ways to make its views prevail.

The recent New Hampshire constitutional convention had an opportunity to direct that both houses of the legislature be apportioned on a population basis. But it did so only after vigorous controversy and much discussion. It refused to change the apportionment of the house and in this action rural delegates were aided and abetted by a number of urban delegates, whose constituents were quite clear that a legal method of reapportioning both houses was available, and that it simply wasn't used.

But beyond all this, there is another cause for grave concern in the Court's decision. Ever since the founding of the Republic, the States and their people have been left free to decide for themselves how to apportion their State and local legislative bodies.

Undoubtedly, many of them have done so in ways which are peculiar to their own circumstances. But the Court has changed their ways over the years in response to popular pressure.

We cannot understand why, suddenly, the Supreme Court has decided it—and it alone—must determine precisely how all such bodies must be apportioned.

We have been sympathetic with many of the Court's controversial rulings in recent years, especially those dealing with individual rights, we find ourselves in considerable disagreement in the case of apportionment, even though we believe the Court's decision is so unfortunate.
DROP IN FARM PARITY PROGRESS IN REVERSE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Byrrey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the 1-percent drop in farm parity income reported by the Department of Agriculture yesterday is due in part to new and continuing price relations for the farmer and from all indications this progress will be remaining in reverse.

The parity ratio, as all Members of Congress know, shows the relationship between prices received and prices paid by the farmer and they fell to a 25-year low of 74 percent of parity last month.

When Secretary Freeman took office the parity ratio was 81 percent. Since then it has dropped each year and according to the latest report of the Department of Agriculture it hit the lowest point since August 1939.

For wheat farmers, Mr. Speaker, the news is even worse. The same Department announced wheat prices at only 56 percent of parity.

It should be pointed out that nothing is being attempted and nothing is being done to improve this situation. The President has threatened to veto a bill even if passed by Congress which would limit beef imports, and the administration forced through Congress a bill which would reduce the support price on wheat from $2 to $1.72 a bushel and the $1.72 includes diversion payment. It seems the Department of Agriculture and the administration are fighting to reduce farm income.

VOTE AGAINST THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bos Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against the civil rights bill today. In my 12 years in Congress, I have voted for every civil rights measure brought to the floor, but I cannot support the final version of the bill.

Earlier this year, I voted with the majority of our colleagues to send the civil rights bill to the Senate in the belief that the Senate would be able to modify the most troublesome sections, including the housing and labor accommodations. I had supported proposed amendments in the House that would improve this bill and which would be more apt to solve rather than compound the racial tensions that have resulted in the prevailing deprivation of the rights of Negroes.

Rather than improve the bill and make it more workable, the Senate added over 60 amendments that further compound and restrict orderly enforcement of the bill. For example, the Senate amendments in substance increase the powers of the Attorney General, who is a political appointee, not necessarily responsive to the people.

The Senate version is being brought out to an unnecessary rule that prohibits any opportunity to debate or modify the Senate's additional provisions.

Under these circumstances, I must reluctantly vote against the measure.

RESOLUTION BY THE FISH AND CANNERY WORKERS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bos Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record at this time a resolution adopted by the fish and cannery workers special legislative conference held by the Seafarers International Union of North America.

I introduce this resolution to emphasize to my colleagues the importance of the fisheries industry to this Nation. As more is learned about the sea, harvest of its fish food resources will increase.

The resolution asks that the well-being of the American worker be considered when decisions are made, when treaties are talked, when actions are taken that could affect American fisheries. The fisheries workers want a voice in consideration of fisheries agreements.

I introduced legislation which Congress has passed to protect our own fishermen within the 3-mile limit. The pressure of foreign fisheries is increasing. Huge trawlers lurk off our shores. We in Congress and those to be the legislative branch, owe it to the fisheries industry and its workers, to see that their rights to harvest seafood resources off our shores are protected and that no nation be allowed to annex a section of our coastal waters and open seas beyond traditional limits due each sovereign country.

Text of the resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF FISHERIES AND CANNERY WORKERS

WHEREAS:

1. The world fishery is a vastly expanding industry as to activity, number of nations engaged, and scientific development; and

2. United States consumption of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

3. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

4. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

5. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

6. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

7. Workmen in the industry have not been adequately represented in the policymaking processes of the executive department of the United States Government; Therefore be it Resolved, That this conference adopt as policy, and attempt to prevail upon the President of the United States to adopt as policy the following:

a. All actions of the executive department, and all its branches, special attention and care shall be given that no action shall be taken which is detrimental to American fishing industry, especially to those actions which are detrimental to American fisheries to the benefit of foreign fisheries, and that every effort shall be made to provide in administration and executive actions to foster, expand, and improve American fisheries and that representatives of those employed in the industry should be adequately represented in all decision-making processes wherein consultation with the industry is indulged.

RESOLUTION OF FISHERIES AND CANNERY WORKERS

WHEREAS:

1. The world fishery is a vastly expanding industry as to activity, number of nations engaged, and scientific development; and

2. United States consumption of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

3. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

4. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

5. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

6. United States import of fishery products has increased in recent years and will continue to increase; but

7. Workmen in the industry have not been adequately represented in the policymaking processes of the executive department of the United States Government; Therefore be it Resolved, That this conference adopt as policy, and attempt to prevail upon the President of the United States to adopt as policy the following:

a. All actions of the executive department, and all its branches, special attention and care shall be given that no action shall be taken which is detrimental to American fishing industry, especially to those actions which are detrimental to American fisheries to the benefit of foreign fisheries, and that every effort shall be made to provide in administration and executive actions to foster, expand, and improve American fisheries and that representatives of those employed in the industry should be adequately represented in all decision-making processes wherein consultation with the industry is indulged.

RETRIEVAL OF DR. JAMES H. WAKELIN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bos Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the June 30 retirement of a distinguished American, Dr. James H. Wakelin, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development.

Dr. Wakelin has served as former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on July 8, 1959. His career has been characterized by dedication to public service and leadership in industrial research. He has participated in many of the scientific breakthroughs which have helped keep our Navy tops in tactical facilities.

Dr. Wakelin attended Cambridge, England University, and Yale. He worked for F. B. Taylor in 1938 and in 1940, then became ordnance staff officer to the Coordinator of Research and Development of the Navy Department from 1943 to 1945. As a lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy Reserves, he was head of the chemistry, mathematics, mechanics and materials sections of the Planning Division, Office of Research and Inventions. Following World War II, Dr. Wakelin joined a group of former Navy research scientists in the establishment of Engineering Research Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C. After serving as director of research for Princeton University for 3 years from 1951 to 1954, Dr. Wakelin established his own consulting business, where he served several industries and was instrumental in founding Chesapeake Instrument Corp., of Shady­side, Md.

Dr. Wakelin is an example of the restless, creative mind which has helped the United States advance scientifically into world leadership. His was the blending of the discoverer with the producer. He is a coauthor with C. B. Tompkins and E. E. Michels of "High-Speed Electronics," published in 1950.

I know that I join my colleagues in wishing Dr. Wakelin many happy, productive years of well-earned retirement.
May I express my appreciation on behalf of our fellow citizens for the extraordinary record of achievement and public service compiled by Dr. Wakelin during the past three decades.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE'S POWER OF DESIGNATION IN ARA

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Administration law is so broadly drawn that it makes the Secretary of Commerce—or the ARA Administrator—a veritable strap or czar when it comes to designating areas for eligibility. Last July Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., told the House that the Administrator already had the authority to group contiguous counties which were not hard up with special, particular counties could be tied to one economic area. The truth of the matter is, however, that after the ARA got the authority and discretion the Administration claimed, it turned out that some counties failed to qualify even under the loose standards. This was so that special, particular counties could be tied to one economic area. The ARA called this “rounding out” an economic area. The truth of the matter is, however, that after the ARA got through with its first frenzy of designation, it turned out that some counties failed to qualify even under the loose criteria ARA was using. This put some Congressmen, who had voted for the legislation and promised their constituents lavish benefits, “on the spot.” So, the new “rounding out” technique was concocted. Under this scheme, the ARA claimed the right to “depress” a county, or series of counties, if it touched counties already eligible under the formula that the group of counties constitute a single economic unit and ARA assistance to a “rounded out” county would benefit the unemployable and underemployment in the contiguous areas. By this scheme, 24 more counties were added to the dole.

But, like the little boy with jam on his face and a guilty conscience, ARA went back to Congress and the legislation to give it its authority which it claimed it already had. The change in the law, said F.D.R. Jr., “merely makes more explicit the authority and discretion the Administrator already has.” For a moment I thank heaven, Congress had the courage and foresight to say “No.” But the ARA still carries those 24 counties on the dole.

Congress should investigate these techniques before it permits the Area Redevelopment Administration to continue.

CALIFORNIA FARMERS ARE TRYING DESPERATELY TO FIND SUBSTITUTE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, ever since Congress served notice upon the fresh fruit and row-crop vegetable growers in California that the domestic labor supply with braceros, the farmers in my district in California have been trying every idea ever proposed. In order to prevent wholesale spoilage of crops, in order to provide jobs for workers in allied industries, in order to save their businesses and land, the farmers are experimenting and testing every conceivable proposal. I want to share these various experiments with Members, so they can better evaluate the comparative values of the bracero program.

The Garin Co., at great cost and expense, and after much planning and preparation, recruited 150 Mexican nationals and 150 experienced field workers from Mississippi and transported them all the way to the Salinas Valley of California.

High school students from San Francisco, who bet the ranch to pick strawberries at the Merrill Farms Co. near Salinas. Puerto Ricans have been contracted by the Santa Maria Association. Texas Mexicans have been recruited by the Yuma (Arizona) Association.

The Carl Maggio Co., of King City, Calif., is working directly with and at the direction of the California State Department of Employment to obtain domestic Mexicans employed. They are currently entering into contract for 350 field-workers at $11.12 per hour, plus fringe benefits.

The Farmers Cooperative of Salinas—Ted Gottlieb, president—has attempted to use “green carders”—legally admitted Mexican nationals.

Mexican nationals earn $1.50, and more, per hour during the harvest seasons. Other workers could earn more. Living conditions are as good as any. Working conditions are unsurpassed. In spite of these favorable conditions, the experiments are not progressing well. As the results are documented, I shall make them available to Congress so that Members can know better how to solve the farm laborers’ plight.

UNITED STATES REJECTS $4 MILLION GRANT FOR FOURTH STADIUM IN PHILADELPHIA—HOUSE SPECIAL HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE URGED TO TAKE NOTE OF HISTORIC DEVELOPMEENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important developments in the Federal urban renewal program has been the stretching of the intent of the Congress past the breaking point. Local officials, encouraged by Federal Urban Renewal Administration decisions in the recent past, have tried to shove every conceivable project under the urban renewal tent. I have been calling attention to this fact for some time now, and I am happy to report that, at least in one case, the intent of the Congress is being preserved.

Plans to use $4 million of Federal urban renewal funds to build a fourth sports stadium in Philadelphia over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks has been rejected by the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner. The rejection was based on the very logical and reasonable grounds that the air space over a thriving freight yard can hardly be called a blighted slum area. This rejection, followed by 1 week my own condemnation on June 22 of the proposed grant of Federal funds—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 23, 1964, pages 14669–14671.

It is my hope that this decision by the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner will be read by other regional directors of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration and reread many times in the future by Federal URA Commissioner L. B. Slayton. I am confident, scientifically we may hope to return to the original intent of the national housing and the Housing Act of 1949, which was to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for people, not to provide it for athletic teams and stock exchanges.

I have in the past called attention to the pioneering work being done by Philadelphia in applying Federal urban renewal grant to help finance a 60,000-seat sports stadium in Philadelphia over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks which was to be underwritten by local funds—daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 15, 1964, page A3218—and I hope that Philadelphia will continue its leadership in the housing and urban renewal field not only as it relates to the enforcement of housing codes but in reforming and humanizing the Federal urban renewal program.

One final note: I would like to call the attention of my Democratic colleagues on the House Special Housing Subcommittee to the fact that the rejection of this stadium project in Philadelphia was made after Federal URA Commissioner Slayton made a personal investigation of the field. To this Subcommittee and the House Special Housing Subcommittee could become equally well informed on a national basis through the same techniques of personal investigation. This would be the logical, and, in fact, it is the only way of preventing further mistakes in solving the problems present in the housing field when we act on the extension of the housing and urban renewal legislation.

I include as part of my remarks several newspaper articles which shed further light on the action by the Federal Government in rejecting the application by the city of Philadelphia for a $4 million Federal urban renewal grant to help finance a local sports stadium:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 29, 1964]

U.S. RULING BANS AID TO STADIUM

(By C. Allen Keith)

An informal agreement on the $4 million in Federal and city funds to purchase the air rights for the proposed 60,000-seat stadium over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at
30th and Arch Streets was turned down Tuesday by the Urban Renewal Administration.

URA Commissioner William L. Slayton said he was prepared to make the statement that "it is clear that the rail yard area does not meet the requirements of law." His announcement was released through Jason R. Nason, regional director of the Urban Renewal Administration, ruling until we have an opportunity to examine the details of the announcement and confer with our urban renewal consultants and city officials."

At the same time, the Philadelphia Real Estate Board voted to go on record as favoring the 30th and Arch Streets site, and said "failure to carry through on this proposal can only do harm to present plans and the actual future of center city." Slayton's rejection of the stadium project was the second setback Mayor Tate has received this week. Thursday Jerry Wolman, owner of the Philadelphia Eagles and Connie Mack Stadium, announced he would not become a tenant at the new stadium.

ASKS PUBLIC OWNERSHIP
Wolman said the stadium should be public-owned.

Mayor Tate, angered by Wolman's refusal, told the Eagles to play at the new stadium, offered to buy the Mack Stadium from Wolman for $50 million. Wolman had previously offered to sell Mack Stadium to the city for $30 million, provided the city would redevelop the 21st Street and Lehigh Avenue property as a modern stadium with adequate parking.

In rejecting the application for URA funds for the stadium project, Slayton said his "decision is certainly no reflection on the urban renewal program being carried out by the city of Philadelphia, which we consider one of the finest in the Nation."

DEDICATED BY LAW
"Rather, it is a decision dictated by the terms and the purpose of the Housing Act passed by Congress in 1949. The only question we have before us is the legal eligibility of the proposal under the Housing Act. No other aspect of the stadium proposal is involved in any way."

"The law states that Federal urban renewal funds shall be used for assisting cities to eliminate 'blighted areas.' It is not possible to interpret these words in any reasonable way as applicable to the rail yards adjacent 30th Street Station.

AREA NOT ELEGIBLE
"This area is one which does not contain 'slum or blighted structures' as the Federal law defines. The area consists of a contiguous area of real estate comprised of urban and residential properties. A blighted area, as the law defines it, must be a physically deteriorated area. If the area is a blighted area, then we must inevitably conclude that virtually every sizable railroad area in the Nation is also eligible as an urban renewal area. This is clearly not what Congress intended."

If the URA had approved the project, the Federal Government would have contributed $25 million and the city $2.5 million toward the purchase of the air rights from the railroad.

TOTAL COST $25 MILLION
The city would be required to put up an additional $6 million for service streets. The total cost in construction has been estimated at $25 million, $15 million of which would be financed by the stadium Corp., comprised of the railroad, Madison Square Garden Corp., and McCloskey & Co., building contractors. Mayor Tate said the rejection of the proposal, which is considered final, said: "I am disappointed in the ruling but it should not discourage us from following through for a stadium building the stadium without Federal funds. This will evidently satisfy the dissenters who are concerned about the use of Federal money for this purpose."

"The importance of building this modern sports stadium is unquestioned," Mayor Tate added. "However, we will continue our negotiations with the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Madison Square Garden Corp."

The mayor said he thought the new stadium could be supported by the Eagles alone, although he welcomed the Eagles as tenants.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1964]

UNITED STATES REJECTS $4 MILLION GRANT FOR STADIUM—RENEWAL UNIT DECLINED SITES IS NOT SLUM OR BLIGHT—GOVERNMENT NOT QUALIFIED

The Federal Government today rejected the city's application for a $4 million urban renewal grant to help finance the proposed stadium on the railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets.

The rejection was announced here by Jason R. Nason, brother of the Urban Renewal Administration, on behalf of William L. Slayton, URA Commissioner. Slayton inspected the proposed site last Tuesday. The rejection was announced in less than a week for the stadium project.

Last Thursday, Jerry Wolman, owner of the football Eagles, said his team wouldn't play in the proposed stadium under arrangements presented to him thus far. At the same time, George Harrison, treasurer of the baseball Phillies, said the terms offered were "very stiff" and must be negotiated further.

NOT QUALIFIED
Nathan said the rail yard area could not qualify either as a blighted or as a slum area under the Federal law.

"As far as the Urban Renewal Administration is concerned, this matter is a closed book," Mayor Tate said. "Our application is final." Mayor Tate said he was disappointed but not discouraged by the ruling and that he will continue to push for the 60,000-seat stadium estimated to cost $25 million.

"This program will go forward," he said.

Nathan, in explanation of the turndown, said that the only question involved was whether "this area will be found eligible as a renewal area."

The city, he recalled, has described the area as a "blighting influence" on the surrounding area.

"An application must stand or fall on its own merit, without consideration to the contiguous area," Nathan said.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., July 1, 1964]

REJECTION LIKELY TO SPEED STADIUM, MCCLOSKEY SAYS

(By John F. Morrison)

Thomas D. McCloskey, president of McCloskey & Co., said today that rejection of the city's request for a $4 million urban renewal grant won't change the Philadelphia sports stadium might prove to be a blessing in disguise.

"It may actually speed up construction of the stadium," said McCloskey, whose construction company is a partner in the project.

McCloskey said the way is now cleared for Mayor Tate's proposal of earlier last month that the stadium be built through the redevelopment authority—without Federal funds.

MOVE A LOT QUICKER
"The redevelopment authority will move a lot quicker than the Federal Government," McCloskey said.

"But," he said, "the Federal application had to be made and acted on before other steps could be taken.

Awaiting a decision by the Urban Renewal Administration has kept the project largely in abeyance since last fall.

McCloskey & Co. is in partnership with the Pennsylvania Railroad and Madison Square Garden Corp., New York, to build the stadium on the railroad tracks over the Pennsylvania Railroad. McCloskey said earlier that the stadium would spark an entire development of the city and would be "the spark for the renaissance of the center of the city."

Details of the proposed project included the stadium, a hotel, and convention center.

"The redevelopment authority would own the stadium," McCloskey said.

"We are still hopeful that the stadium can be constructed without Federal money. We will continue to press for a sports stadium, without Federal money, and without the $4 million Federal grant. The redevelopment authority would own the stadium, under Federal funds, and the bonds would be retired by rentals.

The rejection of the urban renewal grant was made by the regional director, Jasqn R. Nason, yesterday. He made the announcement on behalf of the URA Commissioner William L. Slayton, URA Commissioner.
Nathan said the railroad area could not be classified as a slum area under the Federal urban renewal law. "As far as the Urban Renewal Administration is concerned, this is a matter of a closed book," Nathan said. "The decision is final!"

Nathan said the only question was whether this was a blighted or slum area. The proposal would cover the railroad area as a blighting influence on the surrounding redevelopment areas. "An application must stand or fall on its own merits," he said. "The question to be considered is whether it is contiguous.

NO BLIGHTED BUILDINGS

The law states that Federal urban renewal funds shall be used for assisting cities to eliminate "blighted areas." "It is not possible to interpret these words in any reasonable way as applicable to the railroad area adjacent to the 30th Street Station. This is a district which does not contain slum or blighted structures which will be eliminated. On the contrary, it is an area which is in active, healthy use by a thriving, well-managed industry, and it will continue to be so used."

Tate said he was disappointed but not discouraged by the ruling and that he will continue to push for the stadium. "This program will go forward," Tate added.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Daily News, July 2, 1964]

Pennsylvania Railroad To Revive Stadium Terms, Woolman To Listen

(By Lou Schlenfeld)

The Pennsylvania Railroad is willing to meet Jerry Woolman across the bargaining table—provided Woolman is willing to listen. The railroad will even go so far as to say, maybe the $25 million on stiles at 30th Street still has a prop or two to stand on.

Pennsylvania Railroad officials aren't about to forget the whole project just because the young Eagles' owner walked out on their take-it-or-leave-it terms.

The word is that the Pennsylvania Railroad Financial Chief David C. Bevan and Ned Irish, the Madison Square Garden Corp. president, are ready to talk terms for a stadium with a lease that won't double over Woolman with laughter.

The rejected terms confused Woolman. He couldn't figure whether Irish wanted to be one of his landlords or his partner. It's no secret that Irish's manner caused the Eagles to make up their minds in a hurry. One high Eagles' official said that if Irish had handled things less brusquely, the team would have been willing to sit down and seek a compromise.

Terms dictated by the developers, Pennsylvania Railroad, McCloskey & Co., and the Garden, reportedly included a whopping 20 percent of box office admissions, control of parking, and a cut of concessions.

The proposed fee, charge, of course, for air to fill the pigskinks.

Anyway, Woolman can just sit back and wait for the phone to jangle. He may not have to do much jangling.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 23, 1964]

Early Opinion Due on Grant for Stadium—Renewal Agency Seeks Pennsylvania Railroad Site and Talks With City Officials

William L. Slayton, head of the Urban Renewal Administration, said yesterday that there is a "very good possibility" for Federal grants for air rights in renewal projects.
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Mr. Moshier. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 Mrs. Robert H. Jacobs, Jr., famous author of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," was guest speaker at Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's fifth monthly Women Doers luncheon at the White House. President Johnson dropped by to shake hands with each of the guests and to say a special greeting to Mrs. Jacobs, according to a report in the Washington (D.C.) Post of June 17, 1964.

Mrs. Jacobs, said according to the Washington Post, that the Federal-aid urban renewal programs which displace poor people and Negroes out of their accustomed neighborhoods "are cause for worry."

I was much interested in this talk by Jane Jacobs, whose words were kind enough to send me. I believe this Congress should carefully consider what she has to say in light of the new substantive programs being proposed by this administration for our cities.

One of the main points of Mrs. Jacobs' significant speech, which has not received the attention and study it deserves, is that "a great unbalance has developed in cities between money for building things and money for running things."

The explanation given by Mrs. Jacobs is that there is money available for capital grants to build new parks and new buildings to replace old ones. But the cities do not have the financial resources to maintain and improve existing facilities. Federal grants which encourage making capital outlays often result, says Mrs. Jacobs, in "capital improvements that are wasteful and even inane."

I wonder if the much heralded open space program, for example, does not help to starve existing parks and recreational areas. When I see city after city competing for ever more urban renewal funds to start new projects when many more cleanup people, repair people, and picking up papers.

The wild unbalance between capital funds and running expenses is typical of many municipal services, and of all cities. This unbalance is compounded by the present forms of the subsidies for highways, institutions, public housing, most instances of urban renewal, and by the deicides of public policy which are more important. Most of these cases of aid to cities, especially nowadays the grants for highways, remove money from local coffers, with the money is as low or lower?

Variety and character in parks and in the totality of urban scene will steadily become less and less possible, no matter how lavish our lip service to amenity, unless we get many, many more cleanup people, repair people, painters, gardeners, and so on, working for the public. Many of these jobs, incidentally, require little training.

The wild unbalance between capital funds and running expenses is typical of many municipal services, and of all cities. This unbalance is compounded by the present forms of the subsidies for highways, institutions, public housing, most instances of urban renewal, and by the deicides of public policy which are more important. Most of these cases of aid to cities, especially nowadays the grants for highways, remove money from local coffers, with the money is as low or lower?

Variety and character in parks and in the totality of urban scene will steadily become less and less possible, no matter how lavish our lip service to amenity, unless we get many, many more cleanup people, repair people, painters, gardeners, and so on, working for the public. Many of these jobs, incidentally, require little training.

The wild unbalance between capital funds and running expenses is typical of many municipal services, and of all cities. This unbalance is compounded by the present forms of the subsidies for highways, institutions, public housing, most instances of urban renewal, and by the deicides of public policy which are more important. Most of these cases of aid to cities, especially nowadays the grants for highways, remove money from local coffers, with the money is as low or lower?

Variety and character in parks and in the totality of urban scene will steadily become less and less possible, no matter how lavish our lip service to amenity, unless we get many, many more cleanup people, repair people, painters, gardeners, and so on, working for the public. Many of these jobs, incidentally, require little training.

The wild unbalance between capital funds and running expenses is typical of many municipal services, and of all cities. This unbalance is compounded by the present forms of the subsidies for highways, institutions, public housing, most instances of urban renewal, and by the deicides of public policy which are more important. Most of these cases of aid to cities, especially nowadays the grants for highways, remove money from local coffers, with the money is as low or lower?

Variety and character in parks and in the totality of urban scene will steadily become less and less possible, no matter how lavish our lip service to amenity, unless we get many, many more cleanup people, repair people, painters, gardeners, and so on, working for the public. Many of these jobs, incidentally, require little training.
Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. FOREMAN may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my view that too many times the opinions of the people have been overlooked or disregarded by their elected representatives. Too often, I think, we are inclined to let those immediately surrounding us—the professional pollsters, the news writers, interpreters, columnists, and the bureaucrats—have more influence on our decisions than the folks back home. With this in mind and with the help of hundreds of volunteer workers, I recently mailed out my second annual legislative questionnaire to the citizens of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, Inviting them, individually, to advise me of their views and opinions on some of the major issues facing Congress and the Nation.

The response to this questionnaire was tremendous. It far exceeded the number of replies to my first questionnaire. Over 35,000 answers have already been received, and almost 10,000 of them had additional comments attached. Answers came from every single community and all of the 19 counties in my district—from Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike. Because of this diversified and widespread response, I believe that this poll is a reasonably accurate expression of public opinion.

I am pleased to report the results of these replies for the information and review of my colleagues.

1. Should the U.S. Government guarantee credit for the Soviet Union's purchase of wheat or other commodities?
   - Yes: 32
   - No: 96.8

2. Do you favor the creation of a Domestic Peace Corps or a National Youth Corps financed in whole or in part by Federal funds?
   - Yes: 12.8
   - No: 87.2

3. Do you favor Federal medicine for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?
   - Yes: 13.6
   - No: 85.7

4. Do you favor the administration's proposal of more new Federal welfare programs to end poverty?
   - Yes: 15.7
   - No: 84.3

5. Do you favor the provisions proposed in the civil rights bill now before Congress?
   - Yes: 19.4
   - No: 80.1

6. Do you favor a reduction of Federal controls and regulations of agriculture?
   - Yes: 90.9
   - No: 15.7

7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment permitting voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our public schools?
   - Yes: 98.2
   - No: 19.8

8. Do you think the federal government is too rich or too poor?
   - Rich: 75.2
   - Poor: 20.8

9. Do you think the present standard of living is lower now than it was in 1945?
   - Yes: 85.1
   - No: 14.9

10. Who do you believe would make the best President of the United States, 1964-68?
    - Mr. Lyndon Johnson: 30.1
    - Lyndon B. Johnson: 53.5
    - Governor Reubell: 1.0
    - Governor Branston: 0.0
    - Senator Smith: 4.8
    - Ambassador: 0.0
    - Richard Nixon: 7.6
    - Other or no opinion: 1.0

Mr. Speaker, these views and results speak strongly and forcefully for a concerned American people—God-fearing, taxpaying citizens—people who believe in the free enterprise system and in the preservation of our representative form of government. They are the kind of people who believe two and two still make four, and that all that glitters is not necessarily gold.

They are honest Americans who still believe in the good, old-fashioned principles of fiscal and personal responsibility, individual liberty and freedom, integrity, patriotism, loyalty, and hard work—people who are not afraid to tell the truth and look the world straight in the eye—who are not too lazy to work, not too proud to be poor—people who are willing to live on what they have earned, and wear what they have paid for—people who are not ashamed to say "no" to socialism and communism with emphasis, and who are not ashamed to say, "I can't afford it."

From the results of this questionnaire, it is evident that the people of west Texas fully realize that every dollar that is received from Washington must be paid for by them or borrowed and paid for later by their children or grandchil­dren, with interest added. They know too, that Government does not create money or income that it does not first take from the people. Most of these folks feel that they are getting more government than they need, and more government than they want. One nice little lady was very express­ive in her reply to me by penning in the margin of the questionnaire, "Thank goodness we don't all get the government we pay for."

Mr. Speaker, these people are solid, sincere Americans, who are still puritanical enough to believe that a man and government should pay its debts and not continuously spend more than it takes in. They still refuse to find shame in our power or our creed. They still believe that the American story of individual freedom, responsibility, and dignity is worth telling. They are dedicated, devoted people who put their country ahead of petty partisan consider­ations. They just want to see America win every time. I share their vision. I believe in the American dream, and I represent them in this great, lawmaking body.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up on a farm. We did not have very much money and my folks were not able to give me much in the way of material things, but they gave me the best education that I could have, taught me about individual responsibility and hard work, and, in a way, about capitalism. They taught me that if I wanted to have more material things in my life, I would have to work for them. They taught me that the world pays for the right answers, efficiently delivered—and that the No. 1 question in life is not, "How many storms did you ride out?" or "Did you have a rough time?" but, "Did you do your work in a way that was safe?" They taught me the virtues of honesty and self-respect—and they taught me that when my problems were too great for me, I could always drop my work and say I knew how to get help, from our God above.

I hope Americans never forget, or stray away from these fundamental, basic principles that made us what we are to­day. West Texans have not, and I do not think the American people have, or will, but we could fail if we ever stopped relying on ourselves and started looking to Government to solve all our problems and make all our decisions for us. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree that Government should help, but we must do, it will not be because the world de­veloped a hydrogen bomb—it would be because we have developed a philosophy that says the individual is no longer economically responsible for his own welfare, or morally responsible or his own conduct.

It was American freedom, and that alone, which first made it possible for our country and the world to dream of the ability to use power to transform the world. It is American freedom, and that alone, which is the only really new idea, the only genuine bold new program in all his­tory for the production of wealth for all. It is the product of freedom and initiative, of the individual freedom, responsibility, and dignity which the people of west Texas so well reflect. It is the product of the American story of individual freedom, responsibility, and dignity which I believe is worth telling. I believe it is worth telling for the record of our times. I believe that it is worth telling for the world to know. It is a story of why the American people want to be the lawmaking body, represent­ing the American people in this great House of Representatives.
again, economically and spiritually, and let us place the welfare of this great country ahead of political considerations. All my life I have lived and worked and fought for these truths and ideals. During the past 2 years, as a Member of this Congress, my position has been clearly, plainly, and irrevocably spelled out—on the record. These are the principles I have believed in and worked for—for my Democrat and Republican friends alike. This, gentlemen, is a nonpartisan question, a nonpartisan challenge. It is our country, and our freedom that are at stake. This is far more important than the success or failure of a political party. Indeed, it is the success or failure of the preservation of freedom for our children and for all mankind.

EUROPEANS SPEND OVER $1 1/2 BILLION IN LOTTERIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISCO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record a newsletter issued by Representative E. C. "TOOK" Gathings, Democrat of Arkansas.

Many have the attitude that Congress is remote in its duties if it does not spew forth a stream of legislation. This attitude of "don't just stand there, do something" may be fine in some instances. However, if one is standing on the edge of a cliff, inculcative actions may be more conclusive than desirable. I feel we are standing on the edge of a legislative abyss when we consider legislation with such widespread powers centralized in a very few. I am hoping that my colleagues will read these articles carefully, and give some constructive thought as to the serious nature of the course of action we are being asked to take in the name of fighting poverty.

Text of the articles is as follows:

**POVERTY** PROGRAM

There are a few in the Congress of the United States who would differ with the concern for poverty as its ultimate purpose than to afford the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity to all citizens of this land.

The provision of these related opportunities is the stated aim of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Achieving this aim is required to the well-being of this Nation and to the labors of those of us who serve in its legislature.

The fact that gambling is a normal fact of life and should be treated as such. Congress, 28 countries in Europe, listed below, took in gross receipts of over $1,532,384,000 from its government-run lotteries. The net income to the governments of these countries came to over $651,372,600 which was used for social welfare programs, hospitals, culture, housing, arts, youths, schools, charity, sports, transportation, veterans and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as smart as our European friends? Why cannot we have the courage to capitalize on our own people's thirst for gambling? What is wrong with us when we ignore and close our eyes to a possible additional revenue of $10 billion a year?

A national lottery in the United States will not only strike a lethal blow at organized crime but it will pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt. Is it not time that we stopped pussying-footing and become realistic on this issue? What is wrong with us?
who experience the hardship of poverty, unemployment, and underemployment, and at the same time safeguard the basic philosophy of our Nation and protect against the surrender of our Federal Union to the threat of states' rights and individualism. Some there may be who will view this opposition as a political lever, designed to turn the public against the economic programs to combat poverty in rural areas. The statement of purpose says this: "It is the purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as presently drawn, could effectively deny freedom and independence to every American if it were to become law."

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and the Congress of the United States must stand alert as a bulwark against the forces which could destroy us from within. I submit that the dangers inherent in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 must be clearly present and the American people made aware of the facts. Our political power will be long run our political power will be all the more secure, the more we succeed in underpinning it economically."
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I would like, Mr. Speaker, to spell out exactly how this bill bypasses the school board control of the very form of their traditional responsibilities.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THE JOB CORPS

Title I, part A, of H.R. 11377 establishes a Job Corps within the Office of Economic Opportunity, for young men and young women, 16 through 21, who have dropped out of school. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to "enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the establishment and operation of an Office of conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed."

He is authorized to provide or arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience; and "arrange for the provision of education and vocational training of enrollees in the corps, provided, that, where practicable, such programs include reliance on local public educational agencies or by private vocational, educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantial equivalent training."

Please note that the local public educational agencies would not be in control of the education of the boys and girls of the proposed Corps. "Where practicable," in the opinion of the Poverty Director, educational programs for the Corps "may" be provided through local public educational agencies. The word "may" is most significant.

Apparently, however, the local public school agencies in order to qualify at all would have to set up special programs because under section 104(a):

Only in exceptional cases shall enrollees in the Corps be graduates of an accredited high school or have completed two years of enrollment for enrollment in the Corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any public academic, vocational, or training program is not practicable.

Who does this language make eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps? Who else but the mentally retarded though teachable teenager and the incorrigible school dropout whose further attendance in "any regular academic, vocational, or training program" would not be "practicable?"

Surely not many bright students whose only reason for dropping out of the regular public school system is to work in order to help support their younger brothers and sisters would choose the Job Corps. A boy who did not want his mother to have to accept aid and who is able to get a job to support his younger brothers and sisters would choose the Job Corps.

What the administration warriors against poverty have in mind may be deduced from a pamphlet entitled "The War on Poverty."—A Congressional Presentation, March 17, 1964" prepared by Mr. Schrider's staff.
Explaining the difference between the Job Corps conservation camps and its training programs, the pamphlet says:

"In conservation camps, young men with problems of attitude and resistance to learning will be given basic skills training, as well as counseling, writing, and arithmetic. The training center will choose the "instructional materials designed especially for the purpose" being developed. Teachers will use work-intensive training courses—which will prepare them for their work in the camps." The Federal Government will be in control.

For this reason, at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I will introduce an amendment to bring the Job Corps on a grant-in-aid basis under the administration of the States and local governments.

The school boards and the work training programs

Title I, part B, of H.R. 11377, authorizes the Poverty Director to "assist and cooperate with State and local agencies and private nonprofit organizations in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community activities which whenever appropriate shall be coordinated with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies"—section 112. "The Director is authorized to enter into agreements provided by local programs for all of the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that," among other things:

First, "Enrollees in the program will be employed either (a) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (b) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations, other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used or to be used solely for sectarian instruction or a place of religious worship"—section 113(a)(1)

Second, "To the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State or local public educational agencies, or local program approved pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."—section 113(a)(6)

Third, "The program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants, including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to resume or maintain school attendance"—section 113(a)(7).

Despite the legal lip service to the effect that these work-training programs shall be coordinated whenever appropriate "with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies," Mr. Speaker, this part B of Title I underemphasizes school board authority in three ways.

First, it permits, under section 113(a)(B)(B) Federal aid to parochial schools other than those used solely for sectarian instruction.

Second, where, in the opinion of the Poverty Director, the vocational training and educational services sponsored by the State or local educational agencies, are not adapted to the special needs of the enrollees in the work-training programs, the Federal Government may "make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare." 

Third, The Poverty Director has discretionary power over the coordination "whenever appropriate" of the poverty work-training programs and the training and educational programs provided by the local public educational agencies.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government in the person of the Poverty Director may, under this part, find a local public school system "inadequate and make provision for its enlargement, improvement, development" and so forth.

There is no language permitting the local school board to decline the Federal dollars thus dangled before their noses to follow the Federal lead—even though the school board might be wholly opposed to the Federal proposals. Under the part, the Federal Government would in effect be able eventually to take over all school board functions relating to vocational education and the education of working students and potential school dropouts.

For this reason at the proper time, I will introduce an amendment to bring the work-training programs, on a grant-in-aid basis, under the administration of the States and local governments so that the school boards' decisionmaking prerogatives in this field will not be threatened.

School boards and work-study programs

Title I, part C, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the Poverty Director to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in meeting the "so-called work-study programs" to promote the part-time employment of students of low-income families in work either for the institution itself or for a private or public nonprofit organization.

Although institutions of higher education are not under the control of the local school boards, nevertheless under this part, parochial as well as public schools may receive Federal aid in the form of work-study program—section 124(a)(2)(B).

Since neither the consent nor the advice of the State and local governments is requested under this part, I will, at the appropriate time, introduce an amendment to bring the work-study program on a grant-in-aid basis, under the administration of State and local governments.

School boards and community action programs

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to a massive, multiple attack—not on poverty because the amounts involved are not enough and the means proposed could never win a "war on poverty." No, this is a massive multiple attack on the prerogatives of local self-government. It is a subtle, devious undermining of public education by reducing it to the status of "welfare."
Title II, part A has as its purpose "to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs"—section 201.

The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs sections 203.

The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this section, including the costs of staff training, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted in those fields which are appropriate and consistent with the objectives of the act, including employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and appropriate supplementary programs of nonteaching educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families (sec. 204(a)).

The original bill, H.R. 10629, defined "community action program" as meaning a program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency which is broadly representative of the community—section 202(a)(4).

The word "broadly representative of the community" were cut in committee, Mr. Speaker, meaning that under the bill as it is before us any "public or nonprofit agency" which fights poverty even by providing extra jobs and helping the Director see that they may receive Federal aid. Federal aid conceivably could go to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Communist Party, the John Birch Society, the Nation of Islam, or the Salvation Army.

The original bill also included the language under section 204(b):

Any elementary or secondary school education program assisted under this section shall be administered by the public educational agency or agencies principally responsible for providing public elementary and secondary education in the area involved. No child shall be denied the benefits of such a program because he is not regularly enrolled in the public schools.

Without such language, the highly controversial church-state issue would have come to the fore again. Without the amendment, the administration could not have hoped for the support of the NEA, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and other organizations particularly devoted to the public schools and the general welfare. Indeed, Dr. Adron Doran, president, Morehead State Teachers College, Morehead, Ky., representing the NEA, said in his testimony before the committee:

We oppose with approval that section 204(b) provides for public control of any elementary and secondary school education programs which may develop under this title and that such programs must be made available to all children whether or not they are regularly enrolled in the public schools.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, this whole section 204(b) was deleted in committee thus permitting not only Federal aid to parochial schools, but to any agency the Director thinks would help to fight poverty.

It is not surprising that the opposing sides in the Federal aid to parochial schools controversy have come to the fore again. Without the fact that section 203(b) states that "No grant or contract authorized under this act may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system," there is no legal way the Director can give categorical aid to parochial schools but to any agency the Director thinks would help to fight poverty.

A key to the Roman Catholic position to the reason section 204(b) was deleted and to the formula used in an attempt to make Federal aid to parochial schools unconstitutional is the distinction between an aid measure rather than an educational program may be found in a column by Msgr. George G. Higgins published in the Catholic Standard, May 15, 1964. Reporting on his testimony before the committee Monsignor Higgins said in part:

The members of the subcommittee neither agreed nor disagreed without line of reasoning, but, in any event, they clearly gave the impression that they were at least open to suggestions as to how the bill as a whole might be improved, and, more specifically, how the exclusively public-school language of section 204 might be amended.

DELICATE PROBLEM

The members of the subcommittee recognized a rather delicate problem given the lack of consensus in and out of the Congress on the particular bill in question, which is essentially an antipoverty bill and not a general educational aid to elementary or secondary education.

In the words of this perceptive article, Mr. Miller says, among other things, that President Johnson's antipoverty plan may have a new focus that will allow people to rearrange their old positions (on the question of aid to education) or make them do it, and may open new possibilities.

Let us have an all-out war against poverty, he says. If eliminating poverty requires aid to education, who can object if aid to education for schools to eliminate poverty includes some participation by religious organizations and schools.

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, has this to say about H.R. 11377:

This bill (H.R. 11377) makes an effort in changing "education" to "supplementary educational services" to avoid the constitutional issue by making what is education by any name appear to be welfare in a constitutional sense instead of education.

To authorize the use of Federal tax funds for discretionary allocation to parochial schools by a Federal official, violates the Federal Constitution and constitutes vicious and unconstitutional interference with the sovereignty of the States in the determination of the local education throughout the United States.

At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, in order to prevent the downgrading of American education to the status of welfare, I will move to amend the act for the purpose of determining the dignity and integrity of the school boards, I shall offer an amendment striking part A of title II from the bill.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Title II, part B, authorizes the Poverty Director to make grants to the States which have approved State plans for adult basic education.

To be sure this part does not totally bypass the State and local governments as do title I parts A and B and title II part A. It provides a Federal tax benefit funds for "any kind of categorical aid to education. It has Federal strings attached to make sure that the money goes where the Federal Government wishes it to go. It would tighten the Federal grip on the local school systems in a way which, since we already have passed adult basic education under the Manpower Training Act, would seem to be an unnecessary duplication.

At the proper time, therefore, I will introduce an amendment striking this part from the bill.

THE SCHOOLS AND MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL FAMILIES

Title III, part B, authorizes the Poverty Director to:

Develop and implement as soon as practicable a program to assist the States, political subdivisions of States, public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, farm associations, or other persons for planning and operating programs of assistance for migrant agricultural employees and their families.

We oppose with approval that section 204(b) was deleted in committee thus permitting not only Federal aid to parochial schools, but to any agency the Director thinks would help to fight poverty.

Another front upon which the President and his administration are busily at work undermining the rights of the school boards to control American education is what is being called an urban extension service.

On the morning of June 21, 1964, the Washington Post reported:

At Irvine (Calif.), Mr. Johnson said he foresaw the day when an urban extension service operated by universities will do for the big city what the Farm Extension Service has done for rural America.

The President said he had directed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to meet with educators "to see how that can come to pass."
Just as the House and universities change through the process of our frame, so they can help change the future of our cities, he said.

Mr. FLYNT pointed out that a century ago 80 percent of the American people lived on farms while today 70 percent live in urban areas.

"Back when California's educational gains, he made it clear he does not regard education of a service to adult city dwellers in administration has in mind—and we conduct research but also translate the results into new materials and methods that can be the local control-structure of the National Development System, according to Mr. Keppel of Education:

*Offhand this idea of an "urban extension service" patterned after the Agricultural Extension Service gives the impression* of a service to adult city dwellers in their diverse occupations as the Agricultural Extension Service is a service to farmers in their occupation of farming. But this is only partly true. What the administration has in mind—and we have their own words for it—is a complex of federally financed "research and development centers" in the universities where, according to U.S. Commissioner of Education Dr. Francis Keppel:

Behavioral and social scientists, subject matter scholars, educational specialists, ad

Dissertation in mind and the other sciences which conduct research but also translate the results into new materials and methods that can be evaluated in school settings.

The purpose is not only to bring about curricular changes but also changes in the local control-structure of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

I quote, first, pertinent parts from the House Appropriations Committee hearings, U.S. Office of Education request for funds for fiscal 1965 under the Cooperative Research Act:

Mr. KEPPEL. A new element in the 1965 program which will continue in 1965 would be the initiation of research and development centers which will focus on a wide band of research activities in such crucial problem areas as school dropout, disadvantaged children, talent development, and arts and humanities.

Dr. IANNI. These centers are very similar to the agricultural research centers that did so much for agricultural research (Page 460.)

"A Study of the Structure of Attitudes of Parents of Educable Mentally Retarded Children, and a Study of Change in Attitude Structure." (Volumes I, II.)

A Cooperative Study of the Learning and Adjustment of Truant Children in Public School Facilities, Segregated Community Centers, and State Residential Centers.

"Motivational and Personality Factors in the Selection of Elementary and Secondary School Transfer Students.

"Career Development in the Public School Teaching Profession With Special Reference to Changes in Consumer Satisfaction, Satisfaction, and Dissatisfactions.

"Effects of Children's Social Power and Intelligence on Their Interpersonal Relations.

"Social Structures and Social Climates in High Schools.

"The Quality Measurement Project.

"Restriction Generalization, Bias, and Loss of Power That May Result from Matching Groups.

"A Sociopsychological Study of School Vandalism.

"Relationship of School Experiences to Delinquency.

"The Identification and Measurement of Secondary School Homemaking Teachers' Attitudes and Other Characteristics Associated With Their Ability To Maintain Desirable Learning Situations.


*The use of "New Curricula.*


According to a footnote, page 161:

Dr. Ianni contributed to this chapter in his capacity as official support or endorsement by the Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.
i
tors work continuously on all phases of the program. This is not a new idea and we do not need a new program. But oxygen can be in final form and new curriculum revision programs; we simply insist that joint efforts by each of the interests involved in education be made to implement the results of research as soon as they are available.

The first steps in this movement within the Department took place in 1962, with the introduction of "programmed re- search" activities in the areas of English and teacher education as a means of focusing major attention on these particular problem areas of education. In 1968, a similar programmatic approach is being taken to the area of science. In 1964, there was a change in the arts, in teacher education, and the learning disorders. In each of these programmatic approaches, documents will be available for planning and development programs, basic, and applied research, curriculum development, field testing, and demonstration, and dissemination. Under the present operational plan, each phase of the research program must be applied for separately; but work could be done commonly and coordinated in a programmatic support in 1968 (pp. 106-107).

The heart of the new plan, however, would be the establishment of a series of curriculums studies and demonstration centers for (1) examining existing curriculums in English; (2) design and develop new curriculums where needed; (3) test new curriculums in actual school situations; and (4) produce and make available on a wide scale new curriculums materials. Once the materials are developed they would be demonstrated to teachers through a series of demonstration centers established throughout the country (p. 189).

In our experience with the first 2 years of work, there is a reasonable assurance that this approach has met with great success in both establishing a programmatic approach to the study of curriculums in English and in establishing a model for future programmatic approaches to other subject areas as well (p. 191).

After a lengthy analysis of the U.S. Office of Education's Project English and Project Social Studies, Tann and Josephs tell us:

The hub of the proposed new Office of Education curriculum research and development program would be the Program Center and its associated demonstration schools established by university, groups of universities and colleges, or some public or private agencies associated with a State department of education. Each Center would, with long-term Federal financing, coordinate, establish and operate new curriculums, establish demonstration and training programs, and generally perform all of the functions now scattered among various institutions. Centers would be established in each of the major curriculum areas and would be associated with a nationwide network of model demonstration schools where new curriculums materials developed at various centers would be tested, evaluated, and made available to local school systems (p. 201).

Now all that remains is to assure the more suspicious among educators that Federal aid is not going to cause the school boards to lose their power. We must make sure that the time has come for bold, new steps in the improvement of education. Such steps will not come about without some positive action by the Federal Government for excellence in education and the reality of new curricular revision programs. Much of the progress in the last 2 years has been made possible because the Federal Government has set the stage for action. A new curriculum can ever be in final form because as societies change so do the needs of both the individual and society. The Aristotelian notion of change and reality and Bergson's observation that "we change without noticing it, but nothing but change" are particularly true of education today. Certainly, the reality of educational change has become a changing process; therefore it is the role of the U.S. Office of Education to foster the demands of that reality as it exists in an ever moving and fluid society" (p. 212).

I would like to ask two questions, Mr. Speaker:

First, exactly is the degree of difference between Federal-aiding the school boards into rubberstamping a federally financed curriculum-change and "control of education"? Certainly the net result is calculated, probably by computer, to be the same.

Second, in reference to the statement by Tann and Josephs that "no curriculums can ever be in final form because as societies change so do the needs of both the individual and society." During the last 30 years has any one person or group consciously, deliberately tried to fashion a curriculum to bring about social change?

In 1962, Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Counts, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, a follower of Prof. John Dewey, philosophical "father of progressive education," and research director of a Carnegie Foundation in Washington, D.C., who conducted a study of American education, published a pamphlet entitled "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" in which he said:

The teachers should deliberately reach for power in the battle for the future, that their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they can dramatically and positively influence American society, and in doing so, shape the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation (pp. 28-29).

Today, 3 years later, not only are certain educators deliberately reaching for power but they are being permitted to do so by the Federal Government and at the behest of the Johnson administration. Some of them are even playing interchangeable roles in Government and university institutions. Their object is to establish a curriculum and procedures of the school boards that are culturally and socially acceptable to the public and are at the same time the "leading ideas": Aims and Objectives: National Education Association; the School Board Association; the National Association of Secondary School Principals (p. 50).

Further evidence of the Johnson administration's war on the school boards may be found, Mr. Speaker, in a pamphlet published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in March 1964:

Innovation and Experiment in Education: The Panel on Innovation and Experiment in Educational Research and Development to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the President for Science and Technology.

Although this panel report was not written exclusively by USOE staff, it is a natural sequel to the "Federal Education Agency of the Future—Report of the Panel on Organization and Mission of the U.S. Office of Education." Indeed, the new report outdoes the earlier report in its frankness in regard to local control of education.

In the table of contents of this re-

marchable panel report, we find among the panel's "leading ideas":

"Inductive Teaching"; (Education in which children induce generalities for themselves by means of teaching but requires new instructional materials and new teaching practices.)

"The Educating Societies"; (Social and technological change mean that youngsters must be prepared to cope with, and help shape, new developments.)

"The Panel's Aim is to suggest possible lines of action for Government offices and agencies involved in education.)

Before going on to quote from the panel report itself, I would let the panel identify itself. The panel are we are told on page 59:

"Was established in 1961 to operate under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Like other such panels, it reports to the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, who is also chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee. The panel's specific aim is to suggest possible lines of action for Government offices and agencies involved in education.)

The panel conducts business, and works to persuade other groups to conduct business, in several ways. There are, first, the regular meetings of the panel. They are frequently invited to these meetings to expand the range of competence in the room and to present special views. Generally, the discussions of such panel discussions are a variety of 3- and 2-day meetings to develop points of particular interest to the panel; 5 to 15 people participate in these meetings, a few of them chosen from the panel and most of them expert in appropriate fields. These meetings have been held on such topics as teacher education and nongraded schools.

The meetings develop new ideas but serve mainly as ways to explore the feasibility of making larger studies, and in some cases to develop possible plans of approach for such studies. Finally, there are the larger studies, or seminars, lasting approximately 2 weeks and consisting of 30 to 50 people; excluding all those from the panel. The seminars have been held on such topics as teacher education and nongraded schools.

The reports of the seminars serve both as guidelines for future action and as mandates for that action (p. 59).

Funds for the meetings of the panel and for some of the special 1- and 2-day meetings come from the Office of Science and Technology, which was established in 1962 in the Executive Office of the President. The Office of Science and Technology supplies staff and other support for the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee. The panel meets at the President's request; special meetings and for the seminars come from other agencies of the Government. The President's Science Advisory Committee, the Office of Science and Technology, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention. The financial outlays of the seminars are supported by the usual procedures of grants or contracts to sponsoring universities. Of course, must pass an agency's usual reviewing procedures (p. 60).

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a federally financed undertaking which has been passed by the usual reviewing procedures of the agencies concerned.
Francis Keppel, now U.S. Office of Education, chaired a special panel meeting on Teacher Education in Chicago, November 9, 1962—as dean of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University—page 68.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Francis A. J. Ianni, Cooperative Research Branch, USOE, from whose chapter in the New Curriculum, has very little variation in product (p. 17).

A number of ideas for improving music education were developed at the seminar. The panel wishes to encourage, and really musical, music series for the school curriculum (p. 18).

Teacher education: One implication is that prospective teachers must study a number of things that a person seeking only competence in the subject study—pedagogy and related matters (p. 23).

At various times in the series of meetings on teacher education, consideration was given to the development of educational complexes in appropriate geographical areas. A complex would include a graduate school of education, several research institutes, institutions devoted principally to teacher training, a large number of public school systems, and institutions devoted to educational research and policy (p. 27).

Besides giving prospective teachers experience teaching in public schools and bringing them into contact with the problems of curriculum development, such a complex would provide an augmented flow of scholarship from the colleges and universities into the graduate school of education, where it might contribute to the formation of educational policies and practices (p. 27).

Reforms as a continuing effort: The effort to improve education—to develop better curricular materials, better programs of teacher education, better evaluation and now all these projects that he teaches (p. 23). Some of these youngsters suffering from one or more handicaps, handicaps pre-disposing them to other handicaps—youth—men who have migrated to midwestern people from a wide range of occupations, workers in service jobs, people in depressed rural areas (p. 29).

The panel wishes to commend, is found in the newly enacted National Vocational Education Act of 1963. The act authorizes the use of 10 percent of all appropriated funds for research and development (p. 27).

Pedagogy is an experimental science, and to protest or criticize scientists is to risk being dogmatic. But the experimenters must choose the places to begin research and the ways to proceed. In this sense the panel can be said to favor a particular approach to teaching, an approach called inductive teaching or the discovery method, even of urban and rural slum schools are failures. In neighborhood after neighborhood across the country, more than half of each age group fail to reach 5 percent or fewer go on to some form of higher education (p. 30).
The page contains a discussion on the role of schools in fostering development, particularly for deprived children. The text highlights the importance of curriculum development, teacher education, and the need for flexible programs that cater to the diverse needs of students. It emphasizes the role of schools as model laboratories for bringing educational innovations, especially in big cities.

For example, the text mentions the idea of an autonomous subsystem within a big city school system and the importance of teacher education, including the need for teachers to exercise more initiative. The text also touches on the role of the United Planning Organization and the Federal Government in supporting such initiatives.

In summary, the page discusses the multifaceted role of schools in modern education, emphasizing the need for flexibility, innovation, and the importance of teacher education in making schools effective tools for educational reform.
Eventually, the school board adopted a watered-down version of W.P.'s proposals. Paul P. felt it would come to naught because the schools would not be a central instrument for effecting changes in the lives of deprived children.

But Hansen, in revealing on Thursday that he fully intended to use the 18 schools for the purpose of helping economically deprived children, has put the schools at the hub of the effort to salvage the talents of slum children.

He fully intended to use the 18 schools for the purpose of helping economically deprived children.

The schools at the hub of the effort to salvage the talents of slum children.

His professional experience includes:

1950-52: Graduate assistant, Pennsylvania State University. Taught courses in: sociological research methods, probability and sampling.

1952-53: Fellow, Behavioral Research Council (Ford Foundation).

1953-54: Instructor to associate professor of anthropology:

- Stanford Sage College.

1955: Awarded Fulbright research grant for research on literacy projections on Ethiopia and Eritrea. Visiting assistant professor of sociology, State University of New York (summer sessions).

1956-57: Teaching fellowship to develop behavioral science course at Yale.

1959-61: Awarded Ford Foundation research grant for research in Ethiopia and Eritrea. Visiting assistant professor of sociology, State University of New York (summer sessions).

In 1961: Research coordinator—acting director, cooperative research program, U.S. Office of Education.

In 1962: Director, Cooperative Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education.

In addition to his contribution to the book "New Curricula" from which I quoted earlier, Dr. Ianni has written:


On page 3 of "Innovation and Experimentation in Education" by Ianni and others, the following is stated: "To the Curriculum and Demonstration Branch, federal grants are now being made to local educational agencies to develop and test new curriculum materials. In addition, grants are being made to local educational agencies to develop and test new curriculum materials."

But the direct federally controlled Federal aid that it would pour into the communities might well act as a narcotic to local initiative and responsibility so that pulling out of it again would require a second American Revolution.

The so-called Economic Opportunities Act, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is not a "war on poverty," it is a power grab. It could easily lead to power actions to the poor and unfortunate while maneuvering to wrench control of education and poverty-relief programs from the State and local governments. I do not mean merely to hurl epithets. I am simply saying this: the problems of education and training, of school dropouts, of juvenile delinquency, and crime and related matters are local responsibilities and when the Federal Government takes over these responsibilities, however well-meaning its officials, we are on our way to losing our liberties, we are on what Professor von Hayek calls in his brilliant monograph "the road to serfdom."
from Tennessee (Mr. Brock) may extend his remarks at this point in the Raccoon and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a constitutional amendment which states that nothing shall prohibit the people of any State from appointing the membership of one house of their legislature. If both houses do not strictly adhere to a new formula based solely on population. The Court's slogan, "one man—one vote" has a ringing appeal to all who believe in fairplay. However, whether it is politically expedient to challenge such a popular slogan or not, we must in all fairness question where they derive the authority for the assumption of this jurisdiction.

This constitutional amendment of the people, by the people, and for the people was rendered asunder by the decision—specifically in the State of Colorado.

Only weeks before the Supreme Court decision, the people of the State of Colorado voted to apportion their two houses, one on the basis of population and the other on the basis of other factors. The constitutional change was approved by the voters of every county, with majorities ranging from 2 to 1, to 3 to 1 and greater. In the most unbelievable abridgment of the rights of the people in our land, the Supreme Court threw out the results and said, in effect, that no longer shall the people of Colorado have the right to govern themselves in such a manner.

The Constitution with its amendments is clear in its intention—each State was meant to be sovereign in matters such as local and State elections. In fact, the U.S. Senate is apportioned on a State line basis rather than in accordance with population.

This constitutional compromise insured that smaller States had the protection of some representation in our National Government. The larger States were to have more votes in the House of Representatives which were apportioned by population. In this way, each has a voice. In this way, even the smallest group was given the constitutional guarantee of at least receiving fair and adequate hearings in the councils of our Nation.

Thus it is with a sincere regret that I felt it incumbent upon me to introduce this constitutional amendment, one which simply spells out again a principle which I believe to be so basic to our American way of life that I find it difficult to understand how any court could violate it; the principle that the people of the United States right and must maintain the right to govern themselves.

THE SIXTH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 12-16, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Shorme) may extend his remarks at this point in the Raccoon and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in observing the sixtieth anniversary of our national recognition of the captive nations.

On the eve of our own celebration of Independence Day, which had its birth on July 4, 1776, it is fitting that we keep in mind the nations of Europe today in physical captivity to the Communist empire.

That these nations, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, White Russia, Bulgaria, Armenia, mainland China, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and Cuba—long for freedom from their state of captivity—is self-evident.

That there is a continuing effort on the part of the U.S.S.R. and her sister Communist nation, Red China, to complete the subjugation of Europe, is also self-evident. This desire for subjugation of other nations is not even confined to the European continent—it has clearly extended to our own hemisphere, and we had a sharp reminder of this in recent years when we discovered Russian missiles and troops on an island only 90 miles off our own shores—Cuba. We will not soon forget that lesson, nor will we overlook the attempts to extend the Communist empire to South America. It almost seems that wherever we look in the world today we find no peace. Yet, we hear daily protestations of peaceful intentions from the Soviet Union, just as did the present captive nations in Europe before their takeover was completed.

We know in this country the value of a dynamic democracy. For those foreign countries which view our national campaigns every 4 years with wonder, we quote words from the writings of one of our American sociologists, Saul D. Alinsky, who said:

There can be no democracy unless it is a dynamic democracy. When our people cease to participate—to have a place in the sun—then all of us will wither in the darkness of decadence. All of us will become mute, degraded souls.

This cannot happen in our country as long as we are aware of the value of our freedoms, and the need to be active in the affairs of our Government. The time to become worried is when the people can no longer become aroused over presidential candidates, and candidates for the House of Representatives or the Senate, or the State legislatures, on down to the local level.

The only way to make the mass of any people see the beauty of justice, and of a government founded on principles of justice, is to show them in plain terms the consequences of injustice. For this reason, I would see important for us to press for creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In this way we will be able to study the results or consequences of what happened to those people of the captive nations when they were taken under the pseudoprotecting wing of the Soviet Union. These people live in twilight zones of the spirit. They cannot freely speak criticism of their government; they cannot publish critical observations of those in power; they cannot travel freely; they cannot take part in free elections—with a choice of candidates—but instead are handed a sop by supposedly casting their votes for one candidate and another, for all intents and purposes, for the same candidate. When news is beamed their way, through the Voice of America, or Radio Free Europe, the broadcasts are jammed with a few rare exceptions. When they get news of our country's affairs, it is news of the kind their captors feel they should hear—in other words, the frailties and the weak spots here and there in our Government and daily life. The isolated cases of freedom are seized upon and turned up as though these are acceptable, daily occurrences which our type of government stands powerless to control. Even our open and public disagreements with one another are used as examples of disorder in a weak people and weak government.

I believe, however, that these people cannot help but realize that if we are able to voice our feelings so freely, we surely have freedom of a unique quality which they could never know. We can enjoy the one thing which the Communist dictators are not able to do, is make captive the minds and hearts of these people, unless they are willing to relinquish these rights themselves.

Our fine and respected former President, Herbert Hoover once said:

The spark of liberty in the mind and spirit of man cannot be long extinguished; it will break into flames that will destroy every coercion which seems to immobilize us.

The spark of liberty is indeed flickering in the minds of many of the peoples of these captive nations. We can see the results of this spark from time to time in news from Poland; news from Cuba; news from many other parts of the world. We hear reports of the stirrings in these countries and we know the history of the world proves beyond all doubt that those who desire freedom will not forever be denied.

We cannot forget our own heritage.

Our desire for freedom overcame the natural reluctance of many to break away from a mother state.

We must be diligent to remind the people in these nations to nurture carefully the spark of freedom. We know
the pretensions of the Communists of a policy of “noninterference in the internal affairs of states” for the falsehood it is. We have free access to information and we have seen clearly the results of the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. since the beginning of its own revolution when it overthrew the rule of the Czar, only to put itself in the same rule of a Communist dictatorship.

Only half a century ago, the world was largely made up of empires. These have gone their way, with but a few exceptions, for the winner is only a fancy head without power to affect the true government of their people.

In its place, however, we have seen the supposedly “peaceful means” whereby the Communist dictatorship has swept into its protective embrace 53 nations on the European continent, and will sweep even more unless they become aware of the falsity of their surface friendship.

Indeed, our own Nation was in danger during the thirties, when the assumption of a depression was true and the false ideology of communism had become attractive to many discouraged American citizens. To a large extent, these same American citizens—once they had awakened to the Communist régime—returned to American principles of government. For those who still remain captive in mind to the Communist ideology we have deep pity, but not the kind of pity that will allow them to freely subvert our Nation without even a word of protest from those of us who truly value our American republican form of government.

We in this country know what it means to earn liberty. Beginning with the first small group of courageous men and women who sought not only civil, but religious, liberty as well, this grew from a small whisper to a shout on July 4, 1776, when the Declaration of Independence came into being. An English clergyman, Caleb C. Colton, once wrote: Libraries will not descend to a people; a people must raise themselves to liberty; it is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed.

To me this truth was voiced in some of the finest words of our history as a nation, and I offer them to each of the captive nations, to ponder and cherish in their hearts until the day they can let the spark become a flame of liberty for their country.

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and distinct position to which they have a right, it is the duty of neither to express sentiments, or engage in the service of others.

These are the words which lighted the torch of liberty for this Nation. These are the principles which, if nurtured, will one day cause the captive nations we honor here today, to throw off their government and provide new guards for their future security.

As long as only a half-dozen people in each of these States, under the guise of these principles, the spark will be kept alive—and one day it will take form and substance and the nations under captivity will throw off their bonds and become free. This is the lesson that the people of the United States have taught to the rest of the world. Every one of them cherishes their added knowledge, born of suffering under captivity, to truly provide themselves with the new guards which will provide protection for their future security.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON APOPORTMENT OF STATE LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntyre] may extend his remarks at this point in the Race to Inaugur and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there have already been expressions of great concern in this House over the decision on the 15th of June by the Supreme Court that both branches of State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population. I would like to add my voice to those who have proposed that something must be done to erase this action. I, therefore, introduce a House joint resolution as an amendment to the Constitution to read as follows:

The Judiciary powers of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity concerning the apportionment of either or both Houses of the States legislature if either or both Houses of that State legislature are apportioned on the basis of population. The Citizens of the State have approved by vote in referendum the composition of representation of its legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this amendment would not only protect our form of government but assure that the interests of minorities and majorities, too, would be guaranteed their rightful protection.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely feel that if we do not act in such a manner as to reverse this momentous decision, minority groups in the United States will be stripped of their most singular voice in Government. But more—that of legislative bodies of our Government, are unique in the representation they give to the will and desires of the majority, while affording, at the same time, protection for the rights of minority. I would like to see this changed. I would not like to think that by a 6 to 3 vote the Supreme Court could usurp the legislative prerogatives of the Congress of the United States. I would not like to think that our House would allow such a thing to happen without protest.

Chief Justice Earl Warren has stated that legislators represent people, and not trees, or acres—that legislators are elected by voters and not farms or cities or economic interests. But it is a fact of our way of life that trees, and acres, and farms, and cities, and economic interests are vital to the welfare of our people. It is about the things we owe to the people of Maine and I know what they mean to the peoples of other States. But if the people of the United States had wanted to change their form of government, this could have been done by popular vote, through their duly elected representatives. Justice John Harlan has hit the nail on the head in his dissenting opinion. He says:

What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible. I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis, all else depends, the reliance on the judiciary for political reform.

Right at the heart of the matter is Justice Harlan’s comment that the Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for its citizens. He states that the Court exceeds its authority and has added something to the Constitution deliberately excluded from it.

Justice Potter Stewart stated that he considered the Supreme Court’s decision a long step backward and Justice Tom Clark also disagreed with the majority opinion. Yet, unless we do something about it, six men have changed the direction of the Nation and altered the historic strength we have found in the Constitution.

I agree with Chief Justice Earl Warren who once held an entirely different view on the matter of apportionment as reported in the July 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report. In a speech at Merced, Calif., on October 29, 1948,

Many California counties are for more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have always opposed any attempt to have representation in the Senate to a strictly population basis.

The same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union—equal representation in one House and proportional representation based on population in the other.

Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation we do have, through the action of a few, and strictly
in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal elements, those who by the apportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would work a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.

Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it.

Mr. Speaker, the present form of our National Legislature has set the pattern for good government throughout the free world. The legislative bodies of our States have confirmed the soundness of our system, in fact, some were well established before the Federal body came into being. The States of the Union and the citizens of the United States must look upon June 15 as the day upon which the delicate balance, which protected all people from the absolute control of the majority, was upset. The Congress of the United States must look upon this day as another day when its exclusive right over the land was abrogated. And I say that this must not happen. It is the duty of this House to act decisively and repair the damage before it is too late.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT—A POLITICAL GIMMICK

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, about 7 weeks ago the President of the United States, with great fanfare, submitted to the Congress his proposal Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1966. The act in its present form is a humbug, and I so stated the Constitution. I say that this must not happen. It is the duty of this House to act decisively and repair the damage before it is too late.

MISSING—CAREFUL THOUGHT AND STUDY

Hearings on the bills have continued through 17 separate sessions over a period of 5 weeks, and one fact has been made embarrassingly clear: the bill, as prepared by the executive branch and recommended by the President, is a prime example of fuzzy thinking and poor legislative drafting. It is vague and ambiguous, it can be interpreted in almost any way one wishes, and it contains provisions which would have the Congress abdicate many of its basic responsibilities.

Witness after witness—including spokesmen for the executive branch who necessarily favor the bill and will assist in its promotion if it is enacted—proposed or conceded the necessity for amendments, clarifications, and revisions of the bill. Perhaps the nadir was reached during the testimony of Secretary of the Interior Udall, who appeared before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on which I serve, on May 6. Secretary Udall's testimony did not seem to bear much relation to the bill that had been recommended by the President. It developed that the Secretary's testimony was based upon the erroneous assumption that a number of specific administration-sponsored amendments to the bill dealing with such matters as highways have been added to the bill subsequent to the hearings. They had not been—and at the end of the hearings on June 11, some 5 weeks later, still had not been—submitted to the subcommittee. In fact, they have not yet been submitted.

When the President of the United States recommends legislation to the Congress, the Members should be able to devote their attention to the merits of the proposal on the assumption that the bill is properly drawn and clearly and precisely reflects the President's views as to the methods and details of accomplishing his objectives. The proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1966 is so cavalierly written that a serious question is presented as to whether the proposal is the product of careful thought and study, as it is publicized to be, or a spur-of-the-moment gimmick mainly with political gain in mind. The administration has spotlighted the plight of some of our allegedly less fortunate neighbors, in one part of the country, often to their great economic advantage. Admittedly, that may have prescribed as one of the goals the alleviation of poverty in the Appalachian region. The Administration has not been and, in all directions ballyhooing a hastily drawn, poorly conceived, ineffective, and inadequately developed Federal plan for their assistance.

A proposal to extend massive Federal aid to assist, what is termed, a poverty stricken area is an attractive objective from a humane as well as a political viewpoint. But, in the interests of the people of Appalachia, as well as the million, possibly more, who live in the region, the details of such a proposal must be closely examined to assure that it will actually be beneficial to the people who need help, rather than merely aiding politicians in the area, and making them a part of the country, often to their great economic advantage.

UNLIMITED SPENDING FOR THE SAKE OF SPENDING

The mere spending of great sums of money by the Federal Government will not necessarily assure permanent economic improvement of the Appalachian region. The cost of projects, whenever the Federal Government may have prescribed as one of the goals the alleviation of poverty in the Appalachian region, is an open-end, blanket authorization for the purposes to be eligible for this increased Federal share of the cost. Furthermore, there is neither any time limit nor any dollar limit on this Appalachian WP A portion of the bill. Projects, as distinguished from the number of unemployed persons actually put to work, but even these figures have been balloonod out of all reason, apparently in an effort to secure congressional authorization of additional funds. The Comptroller General of the United States, in a report to the Congress in May of this year, advised that the ARA has overstated the on-site man-months actually worked on projects by from 83 to 128 percent. Furthermore, the on-site man-month project cost has been fantastically high, frequently exceeding $500,000, and in at least one instance exceeding $1 million. The expenditure of almost $900 million under the PWA program may have helped some, but it has been of little demonstrated assistance to unemployed persons.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FEDERAL FUNDS WAIVE STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

We find this same type of PWA program included in the President's proposal Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1966—and better—insofar as the expenditure of public funds is concerned. Section 216 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce—who is in charge of the ARA—and the governors of the 10 States to allocate unlimited Federal funds for 100 percent of the cost of such existing and future Federal grant-in-aid programs as he may designate, except for construction of highways. This 100 percent Federal financing would be available until the beginning of the third full fiscal year after enactment of the bill, and thereafter the Federal share of the cost would not exceed 80 percent.

The PWA Act of 1935 established the maximum of only 75 percent Federal contribution to the cost of projects, whenever the State or local government cannot pay all of its usual 50-percent share of the cost. It would appear that all existing grant-in-aid programs, including PWA and ARA, and all grant-in-aid programs to be enacted by Congress in the future, which provide assistance for the construction or operation of facilities, would be eligible for 100 percent Federal financing. Irrespective of what Congress may have prescribed as State and local matching funds requirements, for whatever good and valid reason, under the proposed legislation such requirements can be waived by the Secretary of Commerce for all or parts of those portions of the 10 States within the designated Appalachian region.

There is also justification for an expanded and 100-percent financed PWA program in Appalachia, particularly when its nationwide application has not proved to be effective in securing the desired results. Furthermore, there is neither any time limit nor any dollar limit on this Appalachian WPA portion of the bill.

A BLANK CHECK PROGRAM

In fact, there is no dollar limit on any portions of the legislation proposed by the President, except for the construc-
the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary, without any limitation whatever in, to carry out, or in the event of its abandonment of all or any of the remaining programs contained in the bill. No administration witness who appeared before the ad hoc subcommittee would even hazard a guess as to how much the entire Appalachian program would ultimately cost the American taxpayers, although the figure of $4.6 billion has been rumored for a 3-year period. Furthermore, the bill imposes no time limit on the many programs it encompasses, except to provide that the Federal funds for the operation of health facilities could be made available to the Appalachian Regional Commission. As this is an proposed by the Commission.

The Commission apparently is not a Federal agency—although this is subject to doubt as other parts of the bill—and its officers and employees are not considered Federal employees. Yet, the Federal Government will pay, under section 105, all of the expenses of the Commission for 2 to 3 fiscal years, and half of such expenses thereafter.

Who would submit a budget for such expenses, to whom would the funds be appropriated, and who, if anyone, would audit the books, is not stated. There seems to be no real Federal control over the amount of such expenses, which, considering the functions of the Commission, could be substantial.

Also, sections 106(c) and 107(b) of the bill authorize Federal agencies to make available to the Appalachian Regional Commission information and personnel "on a reimbursable or, where appropriate, nonreimbursable basis." The bill contains no indication as to when or why it would be "appropriate" to decide whether these aids would be on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis. Nor do they indicate who would make the decision.

A NEW GOVERNMENT BUREAU?

Of really deep concern is the question of who will administer the various programs provided for in the bill. Will it be the existing agencies—State or Federal—or will it be the Appalachian Regional Commission acting as a superagency for the Appalachian region? The bill requires that all programs it authorizes—those establishing developmental highways and access roads from 50 percent to a maximum of 80 percent, and authorizes the appropriation of $185 million for this purpose. The bill contains no real guidelines, limitations, or criteria concerning the increased Federal share. Furthermore, under the bill, the Secretary would have authority to increase the Federal share to a maximum while denying such increase to others—all without control by the Congress.

CABINET MEMBERS EMPowered TO DELEGATE POWERS

Section 303 of the bill states:

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to delegate his functions under this Act, to the extent he deems appropriate, to the Administrator of the Appalachian Development Corporation appointed pursuant to section 201 of this Act, and the authority to waive or modify funds or carry out projects shall be in addition to, and not in limitation of, any authority now existing or otherwise granted by this Act.

The Appalachian Development Corporation would be basically a financing organization. Its main function would be to provide funds to "local development districts" through loans and purchase of obligations.

The functions of the Secretary of Commerce, under the bill, include administering the development highway and access road program—section 201—the authority to waive or modify funds—section 401—and the authority to borrow from the Treasury—section 202. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to increase the Federal share in one instance, or criteria concerning the increase in the Federal share. Furthermore, under the bill, the Secretary would have authority to increase the Federal share to a maximum while denying such increase to others—all without control by the Congress.
projects in areas where financing is a problem. And this veto power of the Federal member of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and power of approval or disapproval of the Corporation, is obviously without limit. It is obvious that the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in this bill can extend beyond a 50-mile radius of any one city, the Federal member of the Corporation, together with the Secretary of Commerce, is vested with the power of approving or disapproving of the program. Consequently, the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in this bill can extend beyond a 50-mile radius of any one city, the Federal member of the Corporation, together with the Secretary of Commerce, is vested with the power of approving or disapproving of the program. Consequently, the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in this bill can extend beyond a 50-mile radius of any one city, the Federal member of the Corporation, together with the Secretary of Commerce, is vested with the power of approving or disapproving of the program. Consequently, the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in this bill can extend beyond a 50-mile radius of any one city, the Federal member of the Corporation, together with the Secretary of Commerce, is vested with the power of approving or disapproving of the program. Consequently, the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in this bill can extend beyond a 50-mile radius of any one city, the Federal member of the Corporation, together with the Secretary of Commerce, is vested with the power of approving or disapproving of the program. Consequently, the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in this bill can extend beyond a 50-mile radius of any one city, the Federal member of the Corporation, together with the Secretary of Commerce, is vested with the power of approving or disapproving of the program. Consequently, the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.
Who is financing her? Who are the un­ measured forces behind her athletic move­ ment? Are we going to let one godless woman succeed without setting out to re­ verse this move? And should we consider what will happen if we take God out of our schools?

A LESSON FROM THE NAZIS

During the postwar trials of Nazis in Ger­ many in 1946, a former high official of the Third Reich confessed that many in 1946, a former high official of the part in the coldblooded murders of in­ mities, asked: “Do you believe in God?”

Most emphatically not,” the Fuhrer’s dis­ ciple replied.

In countries the world over where God has been deliberately rejected by atheistic rulers, the value of human life is soon belittled.

We of this generation have no excuse not to learn from a terrible experiment which has taken place in our own times.

This know-it-all claims, “Religious people are weak.” Under the Hitler regime kindness was considered weakness; brutality became a virtue.

Those who would enslave man concentrate first on schools as the most effective place to deform and debauch impressionable minds. Thus they quickly eliminate all teaching that reminds the human being that he has a moral entity, that he is made in God’s image and that his rights come from his Creator.

Thus they quickly eliminate all teaching that reminds the human being that he has a moral entity, that he is made in God’s image and that his rights come from his Creator.

The edicts of the Supreme Court shall pass. The laws of God shall never pass.

No child ever became a delinquent or was checked by amendment, will predictably result in the imposition of a godless philosophy on the other 97 percent.

In conclusion, I would like to draw your attention to the following passage taken from the New Testament teachings of Jesus Christ:

“If I can’t come through this case the same as everyone else, bring on the H-bomb shelters, and in public whore­ houses…"

Those are the words of the woman who brought the case to the Supreme Court; the woman who didn’t want her child exposed to prayer.

Every night I shall ask Almighty God to spark each and every woman in America to act now. Do something—a popular vote on our National and State ballots, not at some future date, but now and in the meantime write your Congressman as follows:

“In order to preserve a heritage of speech and religion, we, the women of America, demand that some legally effective measure be adopted forthwith to allow public reading and prayers in our schools throughout our Nation, the United States of America.”

Sign your name and address clearly, Do it now and may Almighty God speak through you.

Permission is granted to print this article.

JO B. REGAN


RICE ANSWERS NCWC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

My VOTE ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.
for this bill. This is purely my own decision. It is with regret that I break with the leadership of my party—but cause me no regret to break with the provisions of this bill, and not to take the easy way out.

When the House first considered this bill in February, I worked for enactment of amendments that would have improved the bill so as to provide for equal rights, without the threat of the destruction of individual liberties. Most of the suggested improvements were rejected. Nevertheless, I voted for passage of the House version of the civil rights bill with the hope and belief that the Senate would be able to improve the worst features of the bill. Instead, it appears to me that many of the amendments adopted by the Senate confuse rather than clarify the real intent of the Congress. Furthermore, many of the Senate changes grant even greater discretionary power and authority to one man—the Attorney General of the United States. No matter how he may interpret the law, the individual Attorney General may be, he is—after all—a political appointee. Vesting such great power in the hands of one individual not responsible to the electorate is fraught with dangers to the basic structure of our constitutional system.

The greatest tragedy of all is that there is no legislative history to guide this one man in the implementation of the law. Observance of the traditional procedures of orderly legislation would have provided the guidance which assures a government of laws rather than of men. Without committee reports on the final bill, without a conference, and with a gag rule which gave the House only 1 hour to consider some 80 amendments, I had no alternative but to vote against passage.

IN THE NAME OF CHRISTIANITY

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written concerning the racial disturbances in the South, but which are exploding with equal violence without urging in the North. I believe the most succinct examination of the present-day dilemma I have ever read is contained in an editorial, "In the Name of Christianity," in a recent Shreveport, La., Times. I commend it to the attention of all my fellow Members and do so without the necessity of further comment:

Between May 1 and June 15, a mere 45 days, there were 2,229 racial demonstrations in 338 cities and 40 States of the United States. This is an average of more than seven—almost eight—per day, winter and summer, rain or shine.

The period of time I have chosen has no special significance. It simply happened that the Times asked a Federal Cabinet Department last April for this information and the data given were the latest available at that time and is the latest quickly available at this moment.

The Department cannot be identified because the request was made in a confidential manner. But the statistics are gathered by its own employees, who happen to be stationed in many cities all over the country, and from the periodic reports, the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The figures indicate the constant procdding of that is being carried out all over the country in connection with a desegregation of something or other, or for more segregation than has been granted under law or voluntarily, and for self-asserted rights, so described as rights but may have no connection whatsoever with Federal or State constitutions or with Federal or State laws.

The rate of demonstrations per day probably has increased since the period covered in the above figures—increased with spring and summer vacation. The school which has released tens of thousands of young Negroes of the type belonging to CORE is the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the two organizations whose activities most frequently lead to violence, have not been heard of since they started driving along a highway after paying a fine for being several days ago, indicates the worst. And the "worst" is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe.

It could be said that the two from Brooklyn should have stayed there and joined the Maccabees, an organization formed by Jews to carry out unarmed night patrols because of the increasing number of crimes of violence, racial or otherwise, that obviously has become beyond control of the police; the attempted rape of a Rabbit's wife was an incident merely symbolic of daily routine. The Negro who burns a building is not in the interest of the race or the Negro himself, but is an act of violence, murder, and may merely encourage more incidents of the same type in many places.

But one act of horrible repulsiveness does stand out and cannot be pushed aside. On the Sunday evening of the vacation period invasion of Mississippi for "rights" purposes, the white who murders a Negro for racial reasons, is after all, a political appointee. The impression was given that this is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe. It could be said that the two from Brooklyn should have stayed there and joined the Maccabees, an organization formed by Jews to carry out unarmed night patrols because of the increasing number of crimes of violence, racial or otherwise, that obviously has become beyond control of the police; the attempted rape of a Rabbit's wife was an incident merely symbolic of daily routine. The Negro who burns a building is not in the interest of the race or the Negro himself, but is an act of violence, murder, and may merely encourage more incidents of the same type in many places.

The National Observer and other publications give eyewitness accounts of training at the National Council of Churches, which has released tens of thousands of young Negroes of the type belonging to CORE is the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the two organizations whose activities most frequently lead to violence, have not been heard of since they started driving along a highway after paying a fine for being several days ago, indicates the worst. And the "worst" is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe.

In a school skit by CORE professionals, the college boys and girls witnessed supposed Mississippi people cursing the white northerner with vile and filthy that could not possibly be published or put on the air. The impression was given that this is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe. It could be said that the two from Brooklyn should have stayed there and joined the Maccabees, an organization formed by Jews to carry out unarmed night patrols because of the increasing number of crimes of violence, racial or otherwise, that obviously has become beyond control of the police; the attempted rape of a Rabbit's wife was an incident merely symbolic of daily routine. The Negro who burns a building is not in the interest of the race or the Negro himself, but is an act of violence, murder, and may merely encourage more incidents of the same type in many places.

The white who murders a Negro for racial reasons, is after all, a political appointee. The impression was given that this is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe. It could be said that the two from Brooklyn should have stayed there and joined the Maccabees, an organization formed by Jews to carry out unarmed night patrols because of the increasing number of crimes of violence, racial or otherwise, that obviously has become beyond control of the police; the attempted rape of a Rabbit's wife was an incident merely symbolic of daily routine. The Negro who burns a building is not in the interest of the race or the Negro himself, but is an act of violence, murder, and may merely encourage more incidents of the same type in many places.

But one act of horrible repulsiveness does stand out and cannot be pushed aside. On the Sunday evening of the vacation period invasion of Mississippi for "rights" purposes, the white who murders a Negro for racial reasons, is after all, a political appointee. The impression was given that this is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe.
These things are presented herewith dispassionately, simply as the facts. They are facts that have to exist and certainly should not exist. Surely, the fear created in the Negroes and whites of Mississippi by the training school students of the whole people of a State, active duty personnel in this case, is in the Constitution of the United States as opposed to the Christian way to cure the evils of mankind.

There is no excuse, no justification, for what has happened in Mississippi in the case of the missing or in some other racial incidents.

Do what justification or excuse can be offered, in the name of Christianity, for using Negro organizations (with some white members) to train young college boys and girls to invade areas of which they have no firsthand knowledge and where their presence and immature conduct brings constant danger of inciting both Negroes and whites to violence and bloodshed?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, what would be the reaction of the people of this Nation if they knew that 8,012 of the active duty personnel in the U.S. Air Force receive annual military cash pay and benefits at less than the theoretical poverty level for the United States? What would be the reaction of the people if they knew that approximately 60,000 airmen are considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits, including low-cost housing, free food, dollar grants, and clothing? What would be the reaction of the people if they knew that over 10 percent of the active duty airmen are receiving relief benefits, and that this figure does not include various medical benefits nor the loans and grants made by the Air Force? That is, if they knew that their reactions of these people if they knew that far more personnel would qualify for benefits if identical relief programs were made available to all active duty personnel, and if the Air Force did not resolve some of the problems by granting hardship discharges?

In my opinion the initial reaction would be one of surprise, followed by strong urges to do something about the problem, the poverty of the U.S. Air Force. Yet, the facts I have suggested are true. There are 8,012 of the active duty personnel in the U.S. Air Force receiving annual military pay and benefits at less than the poverty level established in connection with the war on poverty. There are 60,000 airmen considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits. There are more than 5,000 airmen actually receiving relief benefits in addition to those receiving loans and grants and other benefits from the Air Force Aid Society. It is true that more personnel would qualify for these benefits if identical relief programs were available to all active duty personnel, and if the Air Force did not resolve some of the problems by granting hardship discharges.

These sad statistics are facts, not rumors. They may be seen in a study recently completed by the Air Force entitled "Survey of Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel." This dissemination reveals not only the figures that I have cited but the following as well:

Another reason there are not more personnel on relief on poverty is because there are families of two or more members who work after hours to supplement their military incomes. That is, we pay our Air Force personnel so poorly that a substantial number of them are forced to moonlight. For example, in the Strategic Air Command-SAC—our major deterrent force, 11 percent or one airman in nine is a family man working after hours to support his family. Further, most airmen work if shift work or alert duty permits.

In some metropolitan areas more than one-fourth of the married junior officers and airmen have supplemental employment, that is, they moonlight, and up to 10 percent of our senior airmen and Sergeants moonlight.

The highest percentage of moonlighting occurs not at the lowest grades, but in the middle grades where families are beginning to develop and where career decisions are being made. Over 10 percent of the Air Force staff sergeants and 9 percent of airmen first class are moonlighters.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that if these facts were fully known by the American people they would rise up and demand that we stop shortchanging our military personnel. For if we paid our men and women in the Air Force adequately they would not have to go on relief, they would not have to obtain public assistance, they would not have to borrow extensively and go heavily into debt, they would not have to moonlight and the men and their wives would not have to work in order to supplement their military incomes, and they would not have to obtain hardship discharges to extricate them from the mess that one gets into when there is not enough income to support the family.

Last Monday, June 29, I introduced H.R. 11819 to increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month. Surely this is a modest increase from the $30.90 to $47.88 per month that is presently allowed for subsistence. As you know, the subsistence allowance is intended to be used by military personnel who do not eat in the base messhalls for the purchase of food off the base. But you cannot buy enough food with $30.90 or even $47.88 for an adequate diet. And that partly explains why these people have to go on relief, and moonlight and send their wives to work, and obtain hardship discharges.

By the unanimous consent of this House, I include in the Record the "Survey of Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel":

SURVEY OF ECONOMIC STATUS OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

This briefing is the result of a survey of all major Air Force commands taken by the Directorate of Personnel Plans. The survey was taken as a result of a discussion of the Federal war on poverty.

One definition of poverty given by the President's Council on Economic Advisors, as a rough rule of thumb, is an annual income of $1,500 for a single person, up to $3,000 for a family of four. This chart shows the percentage of lower grade airmen by these annual cash income brackets. When the so-called poverty criteria are applied to the Air Force, there are 169,000 airmen receiving an annual military cash pay of less than the theoretical poverty level for the United States. Taken without further clarification, this would be 23 percent of our enlisted force.

"Poverty" formula—Total annual cash income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>1 dependent</th>
<th>2 dependents</th>
<th>3 dependents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$1,999</td>
<td>45,789</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000-$2,999</td>
<td>87,691</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000-$3,999</td>
<td>25,083</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-$4,999</td>
<td>20,683</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$5,999</td>
<td>9,012</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000+$</td>
<td>8,012</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our survey we asked all major Air command, the number of active duty personnel who are eligible for various relief benefits. They report approximately 60,000 airmen who are considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits. The four major benefits are: Housing, food, dollar grants, and clothing. This table shows eligibility as reported Air Forcewide. By far, most of these people are merely technically eligible for low cost public housing regardless of whether or not it is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Total Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>55,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But of 5,000 airmen are actually reported to be receiving relief benefits. These are indicated on this chart. These figures do not include various medical benefits nor the loans and grants made by the Armed Forces Relief Society. Our 5,000 personnel drawing relief benefits include airmen from all ranks but the commands report that it is in the airmen first and second grade, Personnel whom the highest incidence takes place—personnel whom we consider to be career airmen. The availability of State and civic relief benefits varies widely by geographical area. For ex-
sample, many recipients of clothing are either members of a religious organization in San Antonio. The low-cost housing may be available anywhere in the United States. Overseas, such provisions are almost nonexistent, but many areas have a station allowance to offset cost-of-living expenses. We can assume that far more personnel would qualify for such benefits if the Federal government were made available to all active duty personnel, and if we did not resolve some of these problems by granting hardship discharges:

**Various relief benefits**

| Low-cost public housing | 4,698 |
| Food                      | 280  |
| Grants                    | 45   |
| Clothing                  | 34   |
| Receiving                 | 6,000|

Another reason there are not more people on relief is because there are over 71,000 heads of families who work after hours to supplement their military incomes. This figure includes 692 officers. This practice is called moonlighting and varies widely by geographic and economic factors. The number of moonlighters reported by certain commanding officers is shown in this chart. Note that 11 percent of SAC—or 1 airman in 9 in SAC, our major deterrent force—is a family man working another job. The total amounts earned and the number of dependents who work. The results go into the extra hours worked per week, explored in the May issue of your magazine, where career decisions are being made. The results have implications for the future of airmen, which was critical of the investigation into the Federal Reserve System being conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee under the able leadership of Chairman PATMAN. The chairman’s letter defends the investigation of the Fed, the first comprehensive study of this central financial structure, and explains some of the reasons behind it. Because of the light this letter sheds on the investigation and its critics, and because it contains information not publicized to date, I am inserting at this point in the Record the letter on the Federal Reserve System, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the Record the letter to the editor of Banking by Chairman Kenneth WRIGT:

**COMMENTS ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM**

**Mr. HAGAN** of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. GONZALEZ.** Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the magazine Banking reprints a letter to the editor from the Honorable John W. PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. This letter replies to an article that appeared in an earlier issue of that magazine, which was critical of the investigation into the Federal Reserve System being conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee under the able leadership of Chairman PATMAN. The chairman’s letter defends the investigation of the Fed, the first comprehensive study of this central financial structure, and explains some of the reasons for it. Because of the light this letter sheds on the investigation and its critics, and because it contains information not publicized to date, I am inserting at this point in the Record the letter to the editor of Banking by Chairman WIGGERT:
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more than $30 billion worth of Federal securities in its vaults, and which has within itself the power to increase interest rates and tighten money which affects every man, woman, and child in America.

THE BANKER'S FRIEND

Despite the apparent "stand-patism" of the author, who along with his Republican colleagues seems unmoved by the testimony, there is some evidence that the present separate existence of the Federal Reserve is incompatible with the requirements of a modern industrial economy. In sound, Republican banking policy is what comes naturally for most Republican Members of Congress. They think in those terms; they act in those terms. I honestly believe they think they are right. It does not disturb them that they are the bankers' friend, particularly the big bankers' best friend. That they think they are right and that they are the bankers' friend, partly because Congress, but in the grassroots itself. Despite a continuous propaganda smokescreen such as the Widnall article exemplifies, which ignores the basic issues involved, the story of the Federal Reserve, or more properly the Federal Reserve System, continues to be told outside of the American system of checks and balances, is getting across to the Congress and the people. I am confident there will be a continuous barrage of attacks for a year or two. These will not merely be for the American people as a whole—they will be aimed at individual congressmen, and will call for a makeable profit rather than those who would gouge the lender and bring banking back to the days of great depression, when a banker had the lowest prestige in the community.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

P.S.—For the benefit of the Honorable Bill Widnall and some fellow Republicans who agree with him concerning the Federal Reserve System, let me quote from President Hoover's memoirs, page 212: "The Federal Reserve System is a constant menace to the Nation to lean on in time of trouble."

W. P.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 1794

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recess and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, last week the conferees appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives met again to discuss H.R. 1794, a bill providing for the relief and relocation of the Seneca Indians in New York following the taking by the Federal Government of a major portion of their Allegany Reservation in connection with the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir project.

I shall not here attempt to review the unhappy chapter in our Nation's history which precedes this legislation. As the members of the House well know, concerned members of Congress, including myself, have accomplished only at the expense of violating a solemn treaty by which the United States promised to maintain these very Seneca lands inviolate. The time has long since passed, however, for reversing such action. Within a few months, the Senecas will be forced to abandon the reservation communities which they and their ancestors have inhabited for centuries and to find new homes in a new environment.

Though the Kinzua project is fast becoming a fait accompli, there remains an issue of honor, and it is this issue that is being resolved in conference. The issue is whether the United States, having prevented the Seneca people from continuing their chosen way of life and having unilaterally broken its own pledge, will now, by providing adequate assistance, enable the Senecas to begin anew. H.R. 1794, as unanimously passed by the House of Representatives, went a long way toward achieving this goal, and carried the endorsement of the executive agencies involved, as well as the Seneca Nation.

Specifically, section 4 of the bill would authorize the appropriation of $18,931,000 in rehabilitation funds to aid the Seneca Indians in relocating their homes and establishing a new and self-sufficient way of life.

The amendment provided in section 4, however, was reduced by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to $6,116,000, a cut of almost 65 percent. Moreover, though the reduced appropriation is clearly inadequate to enable the Seneca to suddenly enter our culture, the Senate committee added a new section 18 to the bill, calling for the termination of the special relationship between the Seneca Nation and the United States.

The volume of mail and telegrams which I have received from my constituents, and the attention focused upon the Seneca legislation in the press evidence a keen public awareness of the moral question presented to the Congress, as well as a genuine sympathy for the plight of these Indians. In order that justice may be done to the Seneca Nation, I am submitting these views in letters to the House conferees and to Senator Fulbright, chairman, of the Senate conferees.

CACTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ryan) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recess and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the sixth time since 1959, we are observing Captive Nations Week.

President Johnson, in accordance with Public Law 86-90, has proclaimed that the period of July 12-18, 1964, be observed as Captive Nations Week.

The observance of Captive Nations Week points up to the tragedy of the people enslaved by the Communists. It focuses attention on the tragic truth that although the Allies won the war, the defeated enemy countries are subjugated satellites of Soviet Russia, one of the perpetrators of World War II.

To us, living in a free world, the observance of Captive Nations Week should be a time for both prayerful reflection and renewed determination. During this week we as Americans can reflect on the liberties and freedoms which we often take for granted. We can once again voice hope and determination that those captive nations will once again regain their freedom which is their inherent right to enjoy.
years will see these Communist-dominated countries once again as members of a free world.

What appears to be hopeless today may become a reality tomorrow if we can continue our efforts toward forcing these unfortunate nations from the yoke of oppression. The hope of the future is not without opportunity, these enslaved people will rise up and fight their captors. The free nations must keep this hope alive so that this freedom may soon be attained.

SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE BOB SIKES OF FLORIDA

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Matthews) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to have inserted in the Record the following:

I particularly agree with this editorial when they praised the choice of Congressmen Sikes as principal speaker for the officer candidate graduation exercises of the Florida National Guard recently held at Camp Blanding, Fla., which praises our able colleague, and the dean of the Florida delegation, the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes.

As an important member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and as an outstanding authority on the requirements of military defense in this country, Congressman Sikes has rendered a great service to our Nation. All of us in Florida who know him appreciate the fact that despite his high position of importance here in Congress, he is never too busy to advise his colleagues and to help us as he has done before.

I salute this great American, and I am pleased that one of his experiences and ability is so prominently connected with the military affairs of this Nation.

The editorial from the Florida Times-Union followed:

[From the Florida Times-Union, June 27, 1964]

GUARD EXERCISES HALLOW A GREAT TRADITION

The choice of U.S. Representative Robert L. F. Sikes of Florida's First Congressional District as principal speaker for the officer candidate graduation exercises of the Florida National Guard tomorrow at Camp Blanding is entirely fitting and proper.

In addition to serving the people of northwestern Florida in the lower House, the Congressman is also a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve, a rank to which he climbed all the way from the bottom rung on the ladder.

The civilian components of the Army of the United States have a great tradition both in war and in peace. General Sikes was among those Reservists who at the outset of World War II provided a nucleus of young commissioned leaders around whom Uncle Sam could expand the Defense Establishment.

As chief of the Army Reserves of the National Guard and the Reserve officer contingent that the immense emergency war-time growth became possible.

The Federal activation of the Guard units was not without its problems. One of the most difficult of these was facing up to the fact that there was a danger in sending units, made up largely of young men who were all combatilies, to combat together. An untoward fortune of war could wipe out all of the youth in one area at one fell blow. The urgent solution to this problem was using Guardsmen, after a certain period of training, as cadres for new divisions. Thus an entirely new Army was built on the blood and sweat of American youth.

Of the many National Guard major generals who were federally activated at the inception of hostilities, only three remained in command of their units. The Regular Establishment saw to it that the men who wore the ring of the U.S. Military Academy were moved into these positions, after replacing the original commanders. It was held that the Guard commanders, in some instances, were not militarily qualified for their jobs, that they were in their positions by virtue of political pull, a charge that still rankles in the bosoms of the men who received such treatment.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to commend Congressman Matthews and the man from Minnesota (Mr. Fraser) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for all its intrinsic merit, the historic legislation which Congress has concluded passage of today is less an end than a beginning. It is less the victory than the beginning of the total effort and struggle to secure full civil rights and equal justice under law for all Americans.

It can hardly be denied that the grievance of this country's Negro minority is widespread and emanently legitimate. But it is also clear that the law is by no means a panacea. It can only serve to drive more and more Negro leaders are not prepared to relent on their drive or modify their demands. Rather, resist­ence to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. The difficulties arise because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general. The promoters of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteous
It thus appears that in spite of higher profits and higher commercial activities, the banks are reducing their liquidities which is reflected in the continuation of the trend toward the reduction in holdings of U.S. Government securities. In these times, it might well constitute a danger signal.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Warren] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend existing law with reference to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of State legislatures.

In view of the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court it is imperative that corrective steps be taken by the Congress. Unless this is done promptly it would appear that there will be utter chaos in the several States of the Union. We must immediately consider some remedy to the ill created by the Court and take firm action to prevent further usurpation by the Court in this area.

The decision of Justice Brennan in the reapportionment case points out in a very vivid manner the error of the majority of the Court. He has expressed the views of many Americans when he states that the Supreme Court is wandering far afield of its intended jurisdiction when it undertakes to usurp the constitutional authority of the States to determine the composition of their legislative bodies.

No bill would get at the heart of the problem. It simply provides that no U.S. district court shall have jurisdiction to entertain a petition or complaint seeking to apportion or reapportion a State legislative body, nor shall the Supreme Court have the right to review the action of a Federal or State court in such cases. This is a direct and proper legislative manner in which we in the Congress can undo the damage done by the power-hungry U.S. Supreme Court. I urge all of our colleagues to join with us in this effort to bring order out of the chaos created by the unfortunate action of the Supreme Court.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—FOR MEN, TOO—IN THE NURSE CORPS AND MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. Sullivan] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us who have worked long and hard over the years to secure and maintain equality of opportunity for women are sensitive to unequal opportunities in employment wherever and however they exist. So it is with regret that I learn that the press of other legislation will prevent the Armed Services Committee this year from considering H.R. 1034, sponsored by Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, to permit the Army and the Air Force to commission men for service in the Nurse Corps and Medical Specialist Corps. Mr. Bolton is the author of much of our legislation to upgrade the careers and increase the supply of our country's nurses.

Truly, in the nursing field, perhaps more than in any other profession, women are a "little more equal" than men. Men comprise just about 2 percent of the Nation's professional nurses, and many men among that small percentage hold administrative rather than nursing assignments. Nursing has been considered a "woman's" profession for so long that it has always been difficult to attract men into the field. Yet many men have made excellent contributions and many more could be—both in the services and in the private health field. I have received a strong endorsement of Mrs. Bolton's bill from Sister William Marie of the St. Louis University School of Medicine in her capacity as president of the Eastern Missouri Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association. This organization believes passage of H.R. 1034 would be most helpful in increasing the number of male physical therapists by opening up important new career opportunities in the commissioned ranks of the armed services for men interested in being hospital or field nurses.

In 1954 legislation sponsored by Mrs. Bolton enabled men to receive reserve commissions in the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps. Bolton's bill also provided retirement and disability benefits in those corps. The Air Force has statutory authority to appoint men as regular officers in those fields, but since the law uses such designations as "she" and "her," the Air Force would like the United States Code to spell out in clear language that men are as "equal" as women for consideration for such appointments. H.R. 1034 would amend this law to refer to "person" rather than to "women" and to eliminate the word "she" in reference to officers in these categories.

Women have a special stake in supporting Mrs. Bolton's bill. Here we can show by example that we really do believe in equality of opportunity for all who, by training and experience, qualify for the job.

THE GLASS INDUSTRY OF AMERICA

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the glass industry of America is disturbed over
the possibility of a reduction in present tariff levels.

Current hearings being conducted before the Tariff Commission could spell the end of the glass industry in America. Testimony is being given by persons representing all groups within the industry and it would be interesting if I were to read to the House some examples of this testimony for the benefit of all who are interested in this critical situation.

STATEMENT OF ENOCH R. RUST
Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission, my name is Enoch R. Rust, international second vice president of the United Glass & Ceramic Workers of North America, United Steel Workers of America.

I make this appearance on behalf of the membership of this international union and especially so in regard to those employed in the manufacturing of crown, cylinder, and sheet glass. I also appear here as chairman of the stone, glass, and clay coordinating subcommittee on tariffs and trade, a group consisting of 7 international unions with a membership of 250,000.

Every 10 years workers in the glass industry have had the displeasure of working under a cloud of uncertainty and doubt. They could only stand by and watch the price of their product fall, and then rise, and fall again. Their pleas for relief often fell on deaf ears. Many of the melting furnaces with which we are now concerned have been abandoned, some with finished, boxed, and ready-for-sale window glass instead of being in operation (running hot, molten glass down its leiris toward the American marketplace). Workers in this industry were becoming dependent and depressed. There was no confidence in the future because all that faced them was a future filled with uncertainty.

After an extensive investigation, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Expansion Act of 1951, as amended, the Tariff Commission found that serious injury to this industry had been caused by excessive imports and by Presidential proclamation, an increase in duties was levied in order to save the industry.

A result of this long overdue consideration by the Tariff Commission and the President of these United States the worker in this industry is now enjoying his first ray of hope and began to plan accordingly.

Now, when things began to look a bit brighter for these people President Johnson has presented another ray of hope and an indication of this country's standing as of now. This, of course, again raises the mantle of fear and has thrown some members of management into a mood of near panic. In fact, under present conditions a true picture of the actual health of the industry cannot be evaluated. While there has been a lot of squawking by crown, cylinder, and sheet importing nations, the record will show that their ability to live in the U.S. marketplace has not been hampered. Imports of this item have held at or near the 400-million-square-foot mark. Gentlemen, this is a lot of glass. As a matter of fact, Ohio Glass, W. Va., and Georgia Glass, W. Va., center of Appalachia where jobs are still as scarce as hens teeth, is where we find the majority of the window glass producing industry located. We came here to Washington in 1960 and consumed the major part of 3 years showing facts and figures which brought a serious light on this industry and the workers there involved.

We came to seek relief for the people and an industry under continual pressure. We were even granted this relief. Industry, the workers and small business people in these towns all rejoiced in union. This union, and all unions, I feel that Kennedy served as a large measure of security for us all.

We came pleading for protection for this industry and jobs for our laid-off members. We were granted this protection through a duty increase. Laid-off workers were called back to work. In my judgment, there is danger that the rug will again be jerked from beneath us? We pray not. We believe there is a way cause to question the present protection and hope that Tariff Commission will so find. We feel the following information and statistics will support our petition.

Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. at Charleston, W. Va., has two furnaces that are down and not operating during this present time 161 men are still laid off. We have 475,000 boxes of glass in warehouses and 200,000 boxes of uncut glass in stock. If these men are to keep their jobs, we had better get to the bottom of this glass problem.

To demonstrate the ability of the foreign importer to enjoy the American market under present duty levels, we will give you a rundown on import figures for the first quarter of the years 1951, 1962, 1963, and 1964. 1964-1,306,000 50-foot boxes; 1962-2,260,000; 1961-1,218,000; and 1964-1,098,000. Gentlemen, there is no sign of an abatement of the pressure from imports in these figures.

Gentlemen, the weight of advantage in the glut situation weighs heavily in the hands of the Belgians. I feel that it is very important to take into account here that when we speak of trade with member nations of the European economic community, we think in terms of creating jobs for the natives of those nations in order to create a healthy economic atmosphere, but now we find that after full employment was achieved industrialists of these nations did not stop there but instead are now, importing glassworkers from many distant parts of the world.

It is high time that we call upon our friends to give us a hand in helping to alleviate the unemployment of over 4 million Americans and to increase the minimal income of the 37 million other Americans who live in abject poverty.

Let us look at the window glass exporting situations as existing in both the United States and Canada.

While Belgian exports during the 10-year period between 1953 and 1962 increased from 326 to 648 million pounds, an actual increase of 326 million pounds, the American window glass exporters were not quite so fortunate. Instead of enjoying the opportunity to supply all the increase in consumption in the world, our exports had dropped by 2 million pounds annually by 1962.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As you may see, U.S. exports were merely a drop in the bucket compared to those of Belgian and even this drop is drying up. And that is just those exports to Canada and do not leave the North American Continent; in fact, most of those exports to Canada go primarily to an affiliate of one of America's window glass producing companies. Otherwise our export picture would now be practically nil.

This ability on the part of the importers to supply all the increase in consumption in the American market is very dangerous to the American producers and their employees as it erases any and all chance of exports of sheet glass. My first appearance was on August 17, 1960, at the time of the Commission's peril point investigation. My later appearance was on March 18, 1961. In connection with the Commission's escape clause investigation.

The Tariff Commission is, of course, well versed in the sheet glass problem. In addition to obtaining a wealth of information at the hearings referred to above, since the summer of 1960, the President and other members of the industry have completed several detailed questionnaires which the Commission has returned. During the 1960-64 period representatives of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. have also had several visits from the Tariff Commission staff and have given them additional information that they have requested from time to time.

I wish to thank the Commission for this opportunity to appear here.

STATEMENT OF ROBINSON F. BARKER, VICE PRESIDENT, GLASS FIBER GLASS GROUP, PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO., BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, JUNE 30, 1954
Mr. Chairman, we have demonstrated here that: (1) The American window glass industry and workers are still not out of the woods in supplying job opportunity to laid-off workers. (2) The glass picture is at an all-time high and they are importing glass workers from many parts of the world; and (3) the 1962 duty increase has not interfered with the foreign producers' ability to grab off the entire market expansion in the United States but merely checked their inclination to expand their market inordinately.

This ability on the part of the importers to supply all the increase in consumption in the American market is very dangerous to the American producers and their employees as it erases any and all chance of exports of sheet glass. My first appearance was on August 17, 1960, at the time of the Commission’s peril point investigation. My later appearance was on March 18, 1961, in connection with the Commission’s escape clause investigation.

The Tariff Commission is, of course, well versed in the sheet glass problem. In addition to obtaining a wealth of information at the hearings referred to above, since the summer of 1960, the President and other members of the industry have completed several detailed questionnaires which the Commission has returned. During the 1960-64 period representatives of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. have also had several visits from the Tariff Commission staff and have given them additional information that they have requested from time to time.

I welcome the opportunity to appear here today to discuss the current status of the sheet glass problem in that industry which confront my company.

As you will recall, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. owns and operates four sheet glass plants in the United States. They are located at Clarksburg, W. Va.; Mount Vernon, Ohio; Henryetta, Okla.; and Mount Zion, Ill. With the exception of the latter, the business of these plants is confined solely to the production of sheet glass. In the case of our Mount Zion plant, in addition to producing sheet glass, we also perform some fabricating work on sheet glass there.

Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is a diversified company, we maintain separate books and records respecting our sheet glass operations. This enables us to look at our sheet glass business independent from the other businesses in which the company is engaged.

In addition to the above operations we own and operate a large number of other glass-related plants in the United States and Canada.
PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

I am advised that your task in the current investigation of the probable economic effect on the domestic sheet glass industry there to be a reduction in duties applicable to sheet glass which became effective June 17, 1962. In so advising the President, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 states that "the President shall take into account all economic factors which it considers relevant, including the idling of productive facilities, the generation of unemployment and the loss of reasonable profit, and unemployment and underemployment" (see, 861(d)).

Because the statute requires that all relevant economic factors be considered, this means that the standard is not necessarily met if some condition in the domestic industry has merely improved since June 17, 1962. I will state categorically that the facts relating to all relevant economic factors do warrant the Tariff Commission's advising the President to reduce or terminate the June 17, 1962, increased rates of duty applicable to sheet glass.

I will support that conclusion, first, by reviewing the situation confronting the domestic industry at the time the Commission conducted its escape clause investigation. I will then discuss the situation both today and into the foreseeable future, with particular emphasis on the problems of PPG.

REVIEW OF THE SHEET GLASS SITUATION

You will recall, I am sure, the report the Tariff Commission made to the President on May 17, 1961, at the conclusion of the Commission's escape clause investigation of sheet glass. In its findings the Commission stated in relevant part that:

"(a) That as a result, in part, of the duties reflecting the concessions granted therein in the GATT negotiations, a substantial amount of sheet glass, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass * * * are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, both actual and relative, as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like products; and

(b) That in order to remedy serious injury to the domestic industry concerned, it is necessary that the specific duties applicable to such glass under paragraph 219 be increased to a substantially higher level."

In order to analyze the sheet glass situation properly, it is necessary that the Commission's report on the situation confronting the domestic industry. Thus, in arriving at the above findings, it is significant to note that the foreign producers have participated in that growth. I now hand up PPG's second exhibit which is a chart entitled "U.S. Apparent Consumption of Sheet Glass as Supplied by U.S. Producers and Foreign Imports--Years 1959-1964." Here again I invite your attention to the fact that the data for the first quarter of 1964 have been annualized.

This chart shows at a glance the absolute volume of sheet glass shipments by U.S. producers in the period 1959-1964. In addition, it also shows the growth in U.S. sheet glass consumption that has occurred during that period.

We have drawn on this chart a horizontal line which shows the absolute volume of domestic shipments by U.S. producers in the period prior to 1960 level. By continuing the line across the entire span of years portrayed, it is abundantly clear that the foreign producers have participated in the growth that has occurred in the U.S. sheet glass market. And, please observe that this was not only the case in the years immediately preceding the escape clause investigation but also such continues to be the case down to the present.

You will also note that the total domestic shipments of U.S. sheet glass producers have exceeded the total amount they shipped in 1950 by 1960. This is a far cry from that which has taken place in this country since 1950 as compared to a period of over 10 years—the period from 1950 through 1960. We believe that in its present state of domestic production, the industry has a static, relatively inelastic market position can make the economic, technological, and even social contributions which naturally flow from a position of continued progress.

It is important to note that foreign producers also enjoy a substantial advantage over domestic producers. Our studies show that our raw material and production batch costs are approximately 15 percent higher than those prevailing in the Common Market countries.

Another substantial advantage held by foreign producers is the considerable tax advantage they enjoy over the domestic producers. Although the tax rates vary as among the different foreign sheet glass producing countries, the significant fact is that all or virtually all of those countries have lower income taxes than those of the United States. In this setting of foreign labor and raw material costs, tax costs, it is no wonder that the domestic producers' exports of sheet glass are minuscule. During the past 15-year period sheet glass exports by U.S. producers have represented no more than 1 percent of their total domestic shipments. It should be emphasized that this percentage has reached no higher than 1 percent of the foreign producers' exports. Indeed, it is evident that the foreign producers are able to export more than they are now exporting. The simple reason for this rests in the substantial cost and tax advantages held by the foreign producers. Of course, it goes without saying that with the U.S. sheet glass producers being virtually foreclosed from all export markets, foreign producers are supplying all of the sheet glass requirements of the other countries in addition to supplying 24 percent of the United States.

A chart presented on page 123 shows the per pound exchange rates in 1962 (U.S. dollars per pound of sheet glass). One must realize that the present exchange rates are approximately 15 percent lower than those prevailing in the Common Market countries.

The chart just hand up shows the progressive increase in the cost of producing sheet glass when it is realized that our labor cost alone exceeds the total cost of producing sheet glass.

EFFECT OF THE 1962 TARIFF INCREASE ON THE FOREIGNERS

It is appropriate at this point to determine what has been the effect on the foreign producers since the late President Kennedy issued his proclamation increasing the rates of duty on sheet glass.

In my study of your exhibits, my first observation is that the increased rates of duty made effective June 17, 1962, have had no adverse effect on the foreign producers. As a matter of fact, recent reports issued by the foreign producers have indicated the validity of my statement in their published reports. For example, the annual report of
the Societe Generale de Belgique (the company which controls the entire Belgian glass industry) for the year 1963 contains a number of interesting statements. Thus, at page 20, the report says: "For flat glass products and chemicals, the variations in the external markets with respect to all escape clause Tariff Because a statutory provision requires the increase in the rates of duty. Therefore, the de­sumed. And, that is precisely what took erale is interesting but to put it in its proper context, some additional observations will be made. This admission of the port of Societe Generale de Belgique, but to put it in its proper context, some additional observations will be made. For flat glass imports declined during the last half of 1962 and the first half of 1963. Of course, the foreigners would have this Commission attribute the decline in imports to the rise in the American duty, but as was simply not the case. The fact is that the abnormally heavy advance buying which oc­urred during the first 6 months of 1962 resulted in the accumulation of vast inven­tories by the foreigners' U.S. customers. Those swollen inventories needed an ex­tended period of time in which to be con­sumed. That is precisely what took place during the last months of 1962 and which continued into 1963. The decline in imports during this period is attributable to this advance buying and not to the increase in the rates of duty.

It is interesting to note that even though only 6 of the Nation's 14 sheet glass plants are located in Appalachia, these 6 plants account for one-fourth of the U.S. market. So it is highly probable that there will be fewer Appalachian people on these payrolls if the bill is passed than would be the case if the foreign imports continued to gobble up an even greater percentage of the U.S. market.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Appalachian sheet glass plants are par­ticularly vulnerable to foreign imports because those plants normally serve large volume markets in the eastern and southern sections of the United States, where import competition has been exceedingly intense. Therefore, if sheet glass duties are lowered, that could lead to severe reductions in imports into those markets with a concomi­tant adverse effect upon the Appalachian people on those payrolls.

If the Appalachian bill is passed by the Congress, our Government will undoubtedly assist the economy of Appalachia by spend­ing huge sums of money in that area. Al­though I am not an expert on political matters, it brings the total number of employees to approximately 4,500. The other two plants are added to these six, this brings the total number of employees to approximately 6,750. It is interesting to note that even though only 6 of the Nation's 14 sheet glass plants are located in Appalachia, these 6 plants account for one-fourth of the U.S. market. So it is highly probable that there will be fewer Appalachian people on these payrolls if the bill is passed than would be the case if the foreign imports continued to gobble up an even greater percentage of the U.S. market.

Moreover, the foreign producers are operating at such a high level of production that they cannot obtain enough labor to man their new plant capacities, from other foreign countries. The fol­lowing additional quotation from the 1963 Societe Generale Annual Report states the Belgian situation in this fashion:

"Frontiers are now wide open to foreign manpower to bridge the gaps in the local supply. Belgium, after recruiting in Italy and Spain, has had to absorb labor from countries as far afield as Greece, Turkey, and Morocco, despite the high costs and the risks involved in training and retraining this unfamiliar labor and the many settlement problems which arise.

The insufficiency of manpower is the more notable in Belgium since the population of working age is growing less rapidly than in other countries. Various estimates have shown the shortage of workers in Belgium is likely to continue for a long time."

While Belgium was importing workers from various parts of the world in 1963 in order to man their new glass plants, those sheet glass workers were jobless. Specifi­cally, the number of U.S. sheet glass produc­tion workers in 1963 was appreciably less than in 1962. For example, the most recent industry fig­ures which the Tariff Commission has re­ported show that there were an average of 1,901 sheet workers in 1963 but only 737 in 1962.

In our own case PPG employed fewer sheet glass production workers in 1963 than it did in 1959 and 1962. I recognize that our practice of introducing more efficient methods of production, including automa­tion, may account for part of this decline. Of course, with foreign imports ac­counting for one-fourth of all the sheet glass produced, it has always been my belief that the domestic industry could em­ploy more production workers in spite of our constantly improving technology, if the domestic market were given a larger participation in the U.S. market.

THE PROBLEM OF APPALACHIA

While on the general subject of employ­ment in the sheet glass industry, I believe it would be helpful to have the attention of the Congress on the problem of the Appalachian region. This is a problem which has been brought to the attention of the Congress on April 28, 1964 (H.R. 11065). In his presentation to the Congress, President Johnson stated that this bill is "de­signed to make possible the economic de­velopment of the Appalachian region."

The Appalachian region of the United States, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity.

According to the New York Times, the bill contemplates Federal expenditures of at least $1 billion and possibly $4 billion in order to help Appalachian workers.

The Appalachian region is located in a 10-State area. It encompasses all of West Virginia and substantial portions of Penn­sylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia.

The sheet glass industry has been closely associated with the Appalachian region. There are 14 sheet glass plants in the United States. Six of those plants are located in Appalachia, and two others are located in the Appalachian States of Tennessee and Ohio. The six plants situated directly in Appalachian presently employ approximately 4,500 employees. If the two other plants are added to these six, this brings the total number of employees to approximately 6,750.

It is interesting to note that even though only 6 of the Nation's 14 sheet glass plants are located in Appalachia, these 6 plants account for one-fourth of the U.S. market. So it is highly probable that there will be fewer Appalachian people on these payrolls if the bill is passed than would be the case if the foreign imports continued to gobble up an even greater percentage of the U.S. market.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Appalachian sheet glass plants are par­ticularly vulnerable to foreign imports because those plants normally serve large volume markets in the eastern and southern sections of the United States, where import competition has been exceedingly intense. Therefore, if sheet glass duties are lowered, that could lead to severe reductions in imports into those markets with a concomi­tant adverse effect upon the Appalachian people on those payrolls.

If the Appalachian bill is passed by the Congress, our Government will undoubtedly assist the economy of Appalachia by spend­ing huge sums of money in that area. Al­though I am not an expert on political matters, it brings the total number of employees to approximately 4,500. The other two plants are added to these six, this brings the total number of employees to approximately 6,750. It is interesting to note that even though only 6 of the Nation's 14 sheet glass plants are located in Appalachia, these 6 plants account for one-fourth of the U.S. market. So it is highly probable that there will be fewer Appalachian people on these payrolls if the bill is passed than would be the case if the foreign imports continued to gobble up an even greater percentage of the U.S. market.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Appalachian sheet glass plants are par­ticularly vulnerable to foreign imports because those plants normally serve large volume markets in the eastern and southern sections of the United States, where import competition has been exceedingly intense. Therefore, if sheet glass duties are lowered, that could lead to severe reductions in imports into those markets with a concomi­tant adverse effect upon the Appalachian people on those payrolls.

If the Appalachian bill is passed by the Congress, our Government will undoubtedly assist the economy of Appalachia by spend­ing huge sums of money in that area. Al­though I am not an expert on political matters, to me it would be highly inconsistent for this Government to do that on the one hand and on the other hand reduce the present duties on sheet glass so that foreign producers, in countries where overemploy­ment already exists, can supply the glass that the Appalachian workers would other­wise have supplied. Certainly such in­consistent action would not help to secure that domestic industry's share properly in the Nation's prosperity.

FOREIGN CARTEL

I have a few other observations to make concerning the present trend of foreign­ exporting sheet glass to this country. During the year 1963 sheet glass was imported into the United States from 32 foreign coun­tries. Six of these countries are Japan, Belgium, France, Britain, Italy, and Germany. In addition, many of the foreign sheet glass producers who export to the United States hold stock
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interests in each other, and as a result, it is not uncommon for those companies to adopt and pursue policies and practices that are not as sound and as sound as they might be. Whether or not any of those companies are members of an international sheet glass cartel would call for a legal conclusion that between 1960 and 1963 FG's net realized price per unit (i.e., 50 lbs. box) increased 7.9 percent but our total costs increased only slightly over 2 percent during the span of nearly 10 years, I cannot regard this improvement as completely satisfactory. In saying this, I am cognizant of the fact that in 1963 U.S. industrial production has gone up 33.6 percent and gross national product has increased 114 percent. In my judgment, the fact that the improvement in PPG's sales made since 1963 is attributable largely to the tariff increase, it is clear that we cannot be accused of allowing my imagination to stray too far was I to speculate that if the 1962 tariff increase is terminated, it is likely that that action proved to be nearly disastrous. The foreigners' Instant retaliation made it abundantly clear that unless the company's American sales were increased 9 percent and our net income increased 7.9 percent. In the event that between 1960 and 1963 FG's net realized price per unit (i.e., 50' box) increased 7.9 percent but our total costs increased only slightly over 2 percent during the span of nearly 10 years, I cannot regard this improvement as completely satisfactory. In saying this, I am cognizant of the fact that in 1963 U.S. industrial production has gone up 33.6 percent and gross national product has increased 114 percent. In my judgment, the fact that the improvement in PPG's sales made since 1963 is attributable largely to the tariff increase, it is clear that we cannot be accused of allowing my imagination to stray too far was I to speculate that if the 1962 tariff increase is terminated, it is likely that...
crease in PPG’s 1963 shipments. Although we had this information before us in early 1963, we were loath to attempt another price increase for fear that this price increase might have the effect of diverting more business to the foreigners. However, in the summer of 1963 the foreign producers increased their prices by 12 percent in a concerted effort to price their glass higher than PPG’s sheet glass prices and thereby provide a basis for an improved net income position.

You will note from PPG exhibit 3 that even though our net income did improve in 1963, it was still approximately 30 percent below that of 1961. However, in 1964 we increased our prices on single strength and thinner sheet glass and on "B" quality selected for silvering. For years our single strength sheet glass had been lower in price than our "B" sheet glass. In the first attempt at a solution involved a drastic action in order to remedy this situation. Obviously this also reduced the price of our "B" quality sheet glass for silvering without receiving any additional compensation for the added cost such double inspection entailed. Obviously this also required corrective action. With the price changes I have referred to, PPG’s net income in the first quarter of 1964 has shown additional improvement, but it is still 18 percent less than 1963. We are hopeful that this 1964 price increase will assist us to come closer to the level that we achieved almost 10 years ago, in 1955.

Our recent price changes, whether viewed separately or collectively, were absolutely necessary in order for PPG to attain a healthy position in the highly competitive U.S. sheet glass market. I could speak at length about other problems to be answered, and no aspects of our freedom yet to be resolved? Would we not be less proud of an accomplishment, will we be less pleased with an exhibit or an issue, if there were additional and unfinished business left to be done, no more challenges to be met, every disadvantage given, every advantage taken.

No doubt it was a realization of these facts which led John G. Rogers to write in the New York Herald Tribune that the "American exhibit—The Challenge to Greatness"—is noteworthy because in the midst of self-congratulation, it indulges in self-criticism and conceives openly that the United States still has hurdles to clear in such fields as civil rights and education.

We in PPG know that the cost advantage of the foreigners is still overwhelming. In view of this, we are continuing to make every effort to reduce the existing cost disparity by developing efficiencies and improving our technology.

As I have stated earlier, this means continued heavy investment on our part, but to warrant this kind of investment it is axiomatic that the investment earn a return commensurate with the risk. As PPG exhibit 3 certainly shows, we have not yet achieved that result. Therefore, we sincerely believe that the domestic industry needs to operate under the present tariff relief for an additional two years.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated, we earnestly request the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the United States of the need for additional reinstatement. As the factors respecting the sheet glass industry conclusively points to a continuation of the present rates of duty.

THE U.S. EXHIBIT AT THE NEW YORK WORLD’S FAIR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most appropriate on this historic day in this Chamber for me, as an American and as the member of the New York congressional delegation in whose district the New York World’s Fair is located, to raise my voice in defense of the exhibit of the U.S. Government at the fair.

Since this fair opened its doors to the public on April 22, I have heard and read a number of speeches presented by some of my distinguished colleagues in the House, and I have found so frequently the case, those who are satisfied and pleased with an exhibit or an issue, and proud of an accomplishment, will hold their tongues; but let there be the slightest difference of opinion or vague dissatisfaction, and we see the floodgates of criticism open wide.

As I analyze some of the unfavorable comments that have been made about the U.S. exhibit, I am struck by a certain thread of similarity running through them, in substance as well as in the terminology used. I hear it said that the exhibit is a national disgrace, that we have used the pavilion to downgrade America, that we should present something to the world that we are the greatest nation on earth and emphasized our accomplishments instead of identifying our aims.

Yet, is it not true that, great as our national achievements are, we still have a long way to go? Would we not be less candid if we suggested that there is no unfinished business left to be done, no problems to be answered, and no aspects of our freedom yet to be resolved?

The committee’s recommendations follow:

Within a World’s Fair whose theme is “Man’s Achievements in an Expanding Universe,” the committee hoped to dispense with its usual recommendation of the 15–18% increase in net income. The committee hopes to provide a more accurate and meaningful exposition into the character of a nation that serves as a model for freedom and democracy over the burden of proof that a democratic system succeeds.

We would have it known that our democracy is not just a Congress and achievement—it merely offers the opportunity. We would have it known that our democracy has problems—yet that same democracy demands of us that every wrong be righted, every ill combatted, every advantage given, every challenge met. We would have it known that our democracy does not make us great—but does afford us the freedom to become great. It is with these thoughts in mind that we support the Federal government in its efforts to present the U.S. exhibit at the World’s Fair as a part of the theme: “Challenge to Greatness.”
to present to the world not a boastful picture of our unparalleled progress, but a picture of democracy—its opportunities, its problems, its inspirations, and its freedoms.

During subsequent appropriation hearings both in the House and in the Senate Committee on Commerce, which was assigned responsibility for Federal participation in the fair, stressed the fact that the basic theme proposed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee would form the basis for the Federal exhibit. Subsequently, in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1962, the Congress granted an appropriation of $17 million for this purpose. Thus far in the fair's history, the Congress itself gave its stamp of approval to the recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

These recommendations are reflected in a truly imaginative marquee of exhibits which the Department of Commerce and, through it, the U.S. Commission for the New York World's Fair, created for the Federal Pavilion. I have seen this exhibit and I was proud of the fact that I have taken the time to recognize its weaknesses and realize its responsibilities. At a time when so many of us evaluate greatness in terms of wealth, creature comforts, and destructive power, it is refreshing to see our Government emphasize the spirit and the human values which are truly the mark of greatness in a nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me take you, if I may, on an imaginary tour of the Federal Pavilion.

The fairgoer enters a 600-seat theater, where he views an introductory film entitled "Voyage to America." This film was produced and directed by John Houseman, cofounder with Orson Welles of the Mercury Theater; wartime Chief of the Overseas Radio Program Bureau in the Office of War Information; three-time Academy Award winner for "The Magnificent Journey" in 1957, and "Playhouse 90," in 1956 and 1959; artistic director of the American Shakespeare Festival Theater in Stratford, Conn.; and artistic director of the Theater Group of the Adult Education Division of the University of California.

The musical score of the film was written by Virgil Thompson.

The film presents the great cultural legacy and heritage that 40 million immigrants brought to America. It shows a story of motion and change and of greatness based on a migration that is unique in recorded history. It points out that aside from the American Indians, the rest of us—and this goes for every American who ever lived—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Starting with the Pilgrims who came to New England in search of religious freedom and those who came to French, German, Swedes Spanish, and Dutch—who founded settlements of their own, all hoping to find in the New World opportunities which the Old World had denied them, the film depicts the great waves of immigration, first the Irish, Swedes, Germans, and famine, driven off their land, who came

4 1/2 million strong, to build our first chain of canals, railroads, the cities of the Middle West. From northern Europe, the English, Scotch and Welsh, the Scandinavians, Germans, Austrians and Swiss-15 million people from the New World, bringing with them their skills, education, and ways of life. From southern Europe, the Italians—6 million; from impoverished countries of central and eastern Europe, Poles, Romanians, Hungarians, Bohemians, Slovaks, Ruthenians—8 million; from the Balkans and Asia Minor, Greeks, Macedonians, Croats, Albanians, 15 million. It is for this reason that the new land to which a $1200000 ticket gave them entry. They helped to open what was left of the continent; they flowed as workers and consumers into the shops and mills and factories of the cities, the mines and logging camps and oilfields of the exploding West.

The film goes on to show that in times of crisis our doors are still open and newcomers continue to arrive in large numbers; but this does not mean that the American journey is complete. To survive, we must face the challenges which are greater than other generations of Americans have faced in the past. The Fair was planned to extend the discoveries of the immigrants, whose past is our past, to continue their long and painful struggle for dignity and freedom, the film serves as an introduction to the next section of the exhibition.

As he emerges from the theater, the fairgoer enters an exhibition area entitled: "The Challenges: Today." Here an imaginative attempt is made to define and demonstrate through the use of three-dimensional objects some of the major challenges and issues which face the American people today. Divided into two major headings, "Challenges to Freedom" and "Challenges to Peace," the exhibits deal with such challenges as those of equal rights, democracy, learning, growth, social concern, creativity, discovery; and the need for new challenges as those of the free world, the population explosion, the developing nations, arms control, our world community, and the discovery of space.

Here are some of the exhibition items which were selected to portray these challenges:

Enlargements of letters to the President, some on permanent graphic display and others changed periodically, to symbolize the part that the public play in government, from the citizen to the Chief Executive, and the opportunity for all Americans to exercise freedom of expression.

A programed audiovisual teaching and work station where young unskilled workers demonstrate how they may be upgraded through on-the-job vocational training; and three individual audiovisuals, one study booth which display the impact of technology on modern-day education.

A model expressing the sweeping scope of the Central Valley project of California to symbolize the challenge of growth in agriculture and water utilization of our natural resources.

A life-sized design of a simulated blighted area, which not only points up the ugly side of some of our present day slum conditions, but includes an actual model of an urban redevelopment area in Philadelphia.

A large model of the human cardiovascular system and a display of new equipment and techniques and treatment of heart and circulatory diseases to illustrate the progress made in these areas in the past 20 years.

An operating worldwide weather stations receiving signals directly from Tiros and other space objects, to illustrate the space program's contribution to vital areas of nonmilitary research.

A tracking system to detect, track, identify, and catalog all manmade objects orbiting our planet, be they giant satellites or slivers of metal no longer than a pencil. Employing an extensive network of radio operations, high frequency radio sensors, and cameras that can photograph space objects 20,000 miles away, it is manned by personnel of the North American Air Defense Command.

A symbolization of our challenge to secure equal rights for all and to show the Negro movement for equality. Placed in the context of similar historical U.S. drives of our past—in opportunity and in voting—this exhibit is intended to point out that such movements themselves are part of the rule of law in that they exercise both the right of petition and the right of assembly and that they are the responsibility of the public order by which men define justice, make laws, and agree to respect them.

It must be pointed out that at no time does the Federal Government attempt to propagate or recommend specific solutions to the burning issues with which it comes to grips in the exhibit. It merely points out that the problems exist and makes you aware that they represent major challenges which a new generation of Americans must face and, in some form or another, attempt to solve.

The entire upper level of the Federal pavilion is devoted to a mechanized ride entitled "The New World Tomorrow." This is a unique experience that no one should miss. Visitors enter specially de-
Many of those who daily and nightly sit through these showings have pictures at home of grandfathers and grandmothers, perhaps daguerreotypes of immigrants and grandparents like those shown on the screen.

Once this show is over the crowds move to a mobile seating arrangement. It moves in semicircles, in a sort of circular route. On each side and ahead, pictures of America flash on screens. The history of development from the first sea crossing to the time men are orbiting the earth and preparing to go to the moon appear on multiple screens. In the ears of those seated in the traveling theater is the story of it.

There is not much talk among those who come out. They are moved and humbled. America was not always so affluent, with pockets of poverty hidden in mountains and slums of large cities. The shining towers of the fair testify to what man has created. There were sod and logs and implements pounded out on anvils by men called blacksmiths.

One can go to the Illinois exhibit and see a Disney-created Abraham Lincoln rise from his chair and talk about liberty and justice. Or one may go to the Johnson Co. building and see an enchanting three-dimensional film on the freedom and spirit of children over all parts of the globe. But for Americans, the show in the Federal building is the one not to miss.

The full column by Ralph McGill follows:

**America's Itinerary Camera—A World's Fair Show Worth Seeing**

NEW YORK.—Semidarkness came with the pressing of a button. The first half of the Federal building's show here at the New York World's Fair ended tonight with pictures of the people who constitute the world power we call America. Several thousand drawings done in pen and ink sketches by artists of the time, portraying the small ships that came, the first settlements, the Indians, the men in former days, in lace and pantaloons, and the slave ships. The journeys were hard and dangerous. One of over three thousand who started died on the way. One half of those who came were in some condition of servitude. Thousands were indentured servants, apprentices, and indentured laborers. They had to work as laborers for a period of years. And, of course, some were slaves.

**The Tide**

There followed a series of old photographs. The immigrant tide were some 40 million persons—the Irish, Germans, Jews from many lands; Poles, Italians, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Ukrainians; Scandinavians, Bohemians, Romanians, Croats, Serbs, and Bulgars. They came from many lands to join the first adventurers from England, France, and Spain. For an absorbing while there flashed on the screen a long series of these old photographs. Here and there one heard an indrawn breath, a whispered comment, but mostly one heard the whispering of the audience of affluent Americans, able to attend the World's Fair were stifled by these pictures of their ancestors. These early products of the camera's art are magnificent and universal. There is not much talk among those who come out. They are moved and humbled. America was not always so affluent, with pockets of poverty hidden in mountains and slums of large cities. The shining towers of the fair testify to what man has created. There were sod and logs and implements pounded out on anvils by men called blacksmiths.

One can go to the Illinois exhibit and see a Disney-created Abraham Lincoln rise from his chair and talk about liberty and justice. Or one may go to the Johnson Co. building and see an enchanting three-dimensional film on the freedom and spirit of children over all parts of the globe. But for Americans, the show in the Federal building is the one not to miss.

Retirement of Gen. Joe W. Kelly

**The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Libonati.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. Holifield. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Joe W. Kelly, commander of the Air Force's Military Operations, will retire July 18 after nearly 36 years of service. I say this with a feeling of sadness because General Kelly is a friend of many years standing, a dedicated public servant, a fine military officer, and a leader who will leave a lasting mark of his many achievements in the Air Force. For about 5 years, as you will recall, General Kelly was in charge of the Air Force Reserve, where his leadership and capacity he gained a wide acquaintance and many friends on Capitol Hill for his hard work, his unfailing courtesies, his sure touch, and his commonsense.

My regard for General Kelly not only is personal; in a professional capacity, he has appeared before our committee from time to time and briefed us on developments in the Military Air Transport Service, usually called MATS, which is the passenger-cargo arm of our command. The Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has studied military airlift problems, including procurement of military cargo and passenger airlift for the military, extensively; and I agree with Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert that General Kelly is
our “top expert on airlift.” The loss of his services to the Air Force and to the country will be a heavy one.

General Kelly, now 54, took command of MATS on June 1, 1960, as a lieutenant general. Under his direction, and in accord with the recommendations made by our committee of the Armed Services Committee, the command has been rapidly replacing obsolescent aircraft with a modern jet and turboprop airlift force.

General Kelly personally put MATS into the jet age in 1961 when he piloted the C-141 Starlifter, the first jet transport assigned to Eastern Transport Air Force. The Starlifter was designed to meet commercial requirements, and orders for commercial versions of the aircraft already have been placed.

MATS modernization, under General Kelly’s supervision, is an outgrowth of a recommendation which our committee made in a report to the Congress which we presented in 1958. And closely related to MATS modernization is the continuing orientation of the MATS airlift force to hard-core military missions. It was our general contention that MATS should not be a miscellany of obsolete aircraft competing with civil carriers. We said that rather than run a civil-type airline, MATS should acquire the newest modern equipment and direct its activities to military missions which could not be readily performed by commercial carriers. Aircrew training for these military airlifters would have to achieve a maximum of aircraft capability, including airdrop and assault landing of combat troops and equipment.

As executive agent for the Air Force single manager of airlift operations, MATS handles contracts for about $200 million a year in commercial airlift augmentation. This is an important part of MATS work. Our committee was instrumental in encouraging the Defense Department and the military services to use the civil airlift augmentation, so that there would be better working relationships between the military and the airline industry, longer term contracts, fair and economical pricing without cutthroat competition, and the buildup of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

The conduct of this commercial procurement, under the policies we recommended, has encouraged modernization of commercial airlifts. MATS has also resulted in new, more efficient procedures for activating the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, the organization of the commercial carriers doing business with MATS that would back up the military airlift force in various levels of emergencies.

There have been, and will continue to be some difficult problems of procurement of civil augmentation airlift. Our committee always has contended for broad participation by qualified carriers, with due regard to the needs of small business carriers and the all-cargo carriers, all of whom are struggling to survive in an environment of extensive Government regulation and competition from the large and more prosperous carriers.

I know that General Kelly always has been fair and square in his methods of doing business with the carriers, and I trust that his successor, who will be Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., will carry on in the same vein. It should be understood, of course, that the various policies are set at higher levels than the MATS command, although the command has the specific responsibility for purse-chase decisions and for allocating the procurement dollars to the various carriers.

The professionalism demonstrated by MATS under General Kelly’s command has been widely recognized. Just this year the command was named outstanding in the Air Force for its flying safety efforts, existing growth, increased safety record, and its aircraft maintenance record.

Last year General Kelly accepted for MATS the Brig. Gen. Nelson S. Talbott trophy for procurement management efficiency, the first time it has been won by a major air command. His command was cited by the American Public Relations Association in 1960 for having the best military public relations program in the Nation.

General Kelly’s duties as MATS commander take him on many military exercise and inspection trips. Since he took command of MATS he has flown more than a half million miles visiting and supervising MATS operations in the United States, the Far East, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Antarctica. He has logged more than 10,000 hours—more than a calendar year in the air—since he graduated from the Air Force Academy in 1932.

General Kelly was born in Waverly, Ind., on January 19, 1910. He attended DePauw University at Greencastle, Ind., for 1 year before entering the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., from which he was graduated in 1932.

He served as a pursuit pilot, an air mail pilot, and a flying instructor. During World War II he led a 9th Air Force B-26 bomber unit to the most outstanding record in the European theater.

He later served as director of aviation at West Point, commanded Strategic Air Command bomber units for more than 5 years, and won an Oak Leaf Cluster to his Distinguished Service Medal for his 5 years as director of legislative liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force.

His other decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 10 oak leaves, the French Croix de Guerre, the British Distinguished Service Order, the Chilean Legion of Merit, and the Army Commendation Ribbon among others.

General Kelly and his wife, the former Virginia Johnson, of Paxton, Ill., have three children.

To my friend, General Kelly, and to his family, I extend my best wishes and express my great regard and affection.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of May several Members of this body introduced legislation to provide public works and eco-
nomic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Hearings were held on the bills, H.R. 11066 and H.R. 11066, known as the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964, by an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Regional Development of the House Committee on Public Works. During these many days of hearings it became evident that the bill had extremely serious defects in language, drafting and coordination with other existing Federal programs. I would like to make some remarks today generally on the entire bill with some specific comments on the agricultural programs of the legislation. There are a number of aspects of the pasture improvement section which deserve special attention, but first it would be best to look at the entire bill. In questioning the many witnesses on the two identical bills concern was evident over some of the questionable provisions such as:

1. Open-end spending authorizations.
2. Second. Duplication of existing programs and services.
3. Third. Discrimination against the rest of the Nation by establishing a regional approach.
4. Fourth. Estimated costs that range from $4 to $24 billion for the entire program.
5. Fifth. Absolute veto and therefore Federal control of all plans and projects by the Governor of the Appalachian Regional Commission.
6. Sixth. Back-door spending provisions which would allow upward of $550 million to be spent by such provisions.
7. Seventh. Nine-hundred and twenty million dollars for a 5-year development highway program.
8. Eighth. Lack of annual congressional review of the programs and projects.
9. Ninth. Two hundred and twenty-six sections in 1968 spending would balloon into billions in later years.
10. Tenth. The accelerated public works program to meet unemployment with expenditures ranging to $960 million has been called futile.

I see no reason for the Federal Government, acting on behalf of 50 States and 180 million citizens, to give preferential treatment to one section of this Nation when there are other areas such as northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Utah which suffer from equally high levels of economic depression from closing of mines. Some people seem to have forgotten that West Virginia, a State which I am sure everyone would concede is a typical part of the region, has a higher percentage of homeownerlessness, automobile ownership, and washing machine—unnecessary items—ownership than is the national average. The provisions of this bill, who cite $3,000 per annum as being the cutoff point between poverty and nonpoverty, seem to forget that the maximum amount one could receive for being penalized for earning other monies under the social security system is approximately $1,690 per annum. Is not this a form of government-instituted poverty?

Now let us turn to the agricultural aspects of the bill.

Section 203 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to assist in the improvement and development of pastureland for livestock in the Appalachian region. I trust that no one involved in this particular section of the bill shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of improving and developing 25 acres of pastureland utilized by such person. It is my hope that whether this 25 acres are limited to a family, farm unit, or individual. If it is limited to an individual, then a farmer with 12 children in the family, could receive assistance for 360 acres. If it is assistance per farm unit, then the landowners could receive unlimited assistance if they owned a number of farms.

The Department of Agriculture reported that the importation of beef into this country alone, by this act provided 1963, yet at the same time we are holding some land out of beef production in this country and also at the same time we are spending Federal funds for the stocking of surplus American beef. Now the farmers in the Appalachian region are being discouraged from making any increases in the production of beef, supposedly because of the decrease in the average price for beef on the market, but yet the farmer in Appalachia is being encouraged to do so. This is incredibly inconsistent.

Now, some production—if limited to farm-produced and consumed foods—might be justified in terms of welfare and direction. But the program appears to be intended to provide cash incomes to potential producers, and it would only provide for the subsidization of livestock production on an uneconomic basis. Surely considering the technological problems now taken into account, the production of beef by the beef producers of the Nation, a 23-acre improvement per farm is unsound, uneconomically feasible, and (indeed) without any benefit to the farmer. Facts given to us by the Department of Agriculture already indicate that the beef industry now is in an unsatisfactory position as to prices and income. This is a direct consequence of Federal-aid programs intended to improve prices and incomes for grain producers, of a rapid increase in red-meat imports into the United States in the past decade, and of a bulge in beef production. But the program now proposed by this section would be a very substantial capital subsidy to competitors of the existing livestock industries.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a prepared statement before the Subcommittee, stated to be that when the agricultural programs in Appalachian when they stated:

If any assistance is warranted, especially in Appalachia, it should be by increased programs within the framework of the existing agricultural conservation payments program, or—at most—by loans where funds are not otherwise obtainable and not by grants... Section 203(a) provisions constitute an inequitable, unduly favored treatment not available to farmers who develop and improve pastures outside Appalachia.

Farmers in the Midwest keep asking me, “Why do farmers get special treatment in Appalachia? We are having it rough out here too.” What can an adequate answer be? The only adequate answer is the Younger Republican Federation. Involved here other than fighting poverty with the single purpose of eliminating poverty.

The passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act as presently written would only create an agency which would use in its administrative functions funds which could be used by the poverty-stricken of this Nation through other programs. Let’s not establish another bureau to conduct programs which are already in existence. Instead let us aid all of the people of this Nation through sound programs to help themselves. The proper role of the Federal Government in this area should be to promote the general welfare, not to provide for it.

THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. Cramer. 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. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, in the July issue of the New Guard, magazine of the Young Republican National Federation, there appeared a thought-provoking article by the President of the Young Republican National Federation, by D. E. (Buz) Lukens, on the subject, “The 1964 Republican Platform.” I include the article in the Record and commend it to the Members of the House—let it stand on the Republican side—and to the platform drafting committee for its consideration:

THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM—WHAT DO WE REALLY BELIEVE? No More Shopping Lists

[By D. E. (Buz) Lukens]

Besides nominating its standard-bearer in the fall presidential election, the Republican National Convention meeting in San Francisco this month has an equally grave responsibility. For the party must once again determine its policies in broad areas of political controversy, in a manner not only appealing to the American voter, but in a sense deciding the issues on which Republican candidates on all levels can stand.

Its importance, then, is in direct proportion to the importance of the continuation of the two-party system in the United States. While the GOF has for many years been a minority party, the principles for which it stands are in no sense held only by a minority of the American people.

The Republicans who have the primary responsibility for drafting the party’s platform are the members of the committee on resolutions, headed by the Speaker, and the Republican National Convention of 1964. The document they present to the convention, when adopted, will theoretically allocate the party’s position on all major issues from agriculture to statehood for Puerto Rico for the 1964 election and for the next 4 years.
I believe that the platforms as we have come to know them in the past have had certain weaknesses, not the least of which is an undue lengthiness. Therefore, I don’t believe that I am making an unpopular statement if I say that cutting down the platform for 1964 ought to be one of the primary considerations of the committees on resolutions and platform, the state and territory organizations, and the statesmen around the world. We should insist that the United States assume its traditional role as the responsible and mighty leader of the free world, and then outline the obligations of the free world to the free world. The Johnson administration has been steadily denying the free world the real leadership it expects, causing regret in the Free World, and loss of support for our friends. The Republican Party has historically called for more cautious use
of such economic aid, and the 1964 platform should take a positive turn by calling upon other free nations who are economically capable of expanding their private investment abroad, as a means of helping developing nations, rather than only on U.S. handouts. And, most important, the platform must condemn aid to Communist nations.

In foreign policy, everyone recalls the Democratic war cry about the alleged missile gap, which proved to be a hoax. It was charged that the Eisenhower administration had allowed American prestige abroad to slide to a new low. Today I believe the party platform must stress the steady trend toward unilateral disarmament which now passes for strategic weapons systems; their concentration on moon-dogging while ignoring the military and strategic implications of inner space; and their allure in the vital area of defense organization. “Peace through strength” should be the slogan of Republican defense policies.

Three Cheers

In summing up, let me say that besides avoiding longevity and the tendency to be too abstract, the 1964 platform should not be a mere shopping list for the voters, wherein they are invited to compare the promises of both parties and choose the one which gives them the maximum of U.S. handouts. A punchy, hard-hitting, and enthusiastically presented platform can provide the Republican Party and its standard bearers with the undreamed-of inspiration and drive during the 1964 election. But it must be brief, and it must contain a preamble spelling out just what the Republicans really believe.

But allow me to make one suggestion. They could not do better than what was proposed by the Republican National Convention, here in San Francisco: “We are the custodians of a deep and abiding political, moral, and economic philosophy, which can best be summed up in the words ‘individual freedom,’ freedom must be fought for and won by every generation. We pledge to this fight our time, our energy, our resources, and ourselves until victory for freedom at home and abroad is achieved.”

The Declaration of Republican Principle and Policy (June 1962)

We believe in the individual’s right and capacity to govern himself-to set his own priorities, to provide for his family, with a modern and adequate defense organization. “Peace through strength” should be the slogan of Republican defense policies.

Domestically, the key to the party’s platform should emphasize the differences between Republican and Democratic approaches to economy. The Johnson administration feels that the Government’s experts know how to spend America’s earnings wisely. Much is said about growth rates and gross national product. What has been the result? Recession, followed by an unusually slow recovery, the highest unemployment rate since the thirties, and the greatest number of business failures in 25 years.

The Republican view has nearly always formed a perfect contrast to this tax and spend, spend, and tax, policy. Republicans believe that government should encourage economic growth through creation of a favorable economic environment of low taxes, high production, and steadier prices. Our party feels that free enterprise can and will continue to make America grow while providing a high level of living in the market. The Federal counterparts to these healthy business growth are a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, and a stable dollar.

This position is best expressed by standing firm for limited government and for individual responsibility. This means arguing against the increased concentration of power and authority in Washington, as former President Eisenhower has so often done, and against Federal planners and the corruption by Federal planners in Washington.

In the vital area of civil rights, the Republican Party’s traditional stand can well be digested into the 1964 platform in the form of a principle, rather than a lengthy piece of legislation. We should favor, for example, ways of redressing grievances which would preclude herding people into the streets. We should support the trend toward the right to vote, to equal treatment before the law, to hold property, and to the protection of contracts—rights all guaranteed by existing laws. We should demand more detailed information. If our policy is the right to vote is denied just as easily by fraud as by physical exclusion from the voting booth.

Special Orders Granted

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders here-tofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLLIFIELD, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Extension of Remarks

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TRAEGUE of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. DORN. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. LAGER.

Mr. SCHWENDEL.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. BROTHELL of Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY of Georgia. (At the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. RIVERA of Alaska.

Mr. BRADemas.

Mr. SICKLES.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

Enrolled Bill Signed

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7152. An act to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations; to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Bills Presented to the President

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7152. An act to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations; to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Votes taken for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.
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. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9070. A bill to establish a permanent population relocation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 799. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3873, a bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, acting through the Public Health Service, to make contributions toward medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10777. A bill to permit the use of funds derived from fines collected by the District of Columbia for payment of fines and costs and for the indigent; with amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8066. A bill to amend title II of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or seeing-eye dogs for the blind; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9065. A bill to amend the Police and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to allow credit to certain members of the U.S. Secret Service Division for periods of prior police service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9752. A bill to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States over the construction or enlargement of a reservoir; to authorize and permit firefighting use of such reservoir; to authorize the Storage Project on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10688. A bill to permit officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia to reside anywhere within 25 miles of the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11901. A bill to permit the vessel U.S.S. Alabama to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 940. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6793, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to require additional disclosures for the issuance of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

H.R. 11883. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SULLIVAN: H.R. 11884. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABBITT: H.R. 11885. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: H.R. 11886. A bill to provide for an international referendum with respect to the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN: H.R. 11887. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK: H.R. 11888. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period of the Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, of any coins disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: H.R. 11889. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of parts designed for use or chiefly used in agricultural or horticultural implements or in tractors suitable for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE: H.R. 11890. A bill to amend section 1083 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that stock and securities may be treated as replacement property for real property held in farming; in connection with which, all income from such property is taxed by the United States in connection with the construction or enlargement of a reservoir; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE: H.R. 11901. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank which is a member of a Federal home loan bank a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS: H.R. 11902. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by increasing the amount authorized for loans under the Higher Education Act of 1968 and by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work study; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN: H.R. 11903. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: H.R. 11904. A bill to amend and extend the National Foundation for the Advancement of Higher Education and Learning; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN: H.R. 11906. A bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to...
combat poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R.11917. A bill to establish the National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R.11908. A bill to establish the position of the National Miscellaneous Inspector (nonenforcement) in the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to place such position in grade 13 under the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R.11909. A bill to authorize the construction of the National building in Queens County, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R.11910. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the U.S. Narcotics Division in order to improve the enforcement of the narcotics and other antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R.11911. A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of certain organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R.11912. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted under the supplies of coins being available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R.11913. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIL:

H.R.11914. A bill to amend section 1202(a) of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 and the first section of the act of August 3, 1950, so as to provide that the additional House Office Building is nearly complete, their superfluous authority for the acquisition of real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R.11915. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R.11916. A bill to provide for a national referendum on the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R.11917. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R.11918. A bill to prohibit profiteering in the initial distribution of the Federal Building in Queens County, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELESON:

H.R.11919. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R.11920. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to provide judicial review of decisions of the Tariff Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATHER:

H.R.11921. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R.11922. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 58, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R.11923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction by teachers of the expenses of education undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R.11924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturer's excise tax on table tennis balls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R.11925. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R.11926. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENESS:

H.R.11927. A bill to prevent the Federal courts exercising jurisdiction in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of the legislature of any State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R.11928. A bill to allow the State of Texas to use certain funds for the improve­ment of National Guard armories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.J. Res.1167. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.J. Res.1168. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHORD:

H.J. Res.1169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.J. Res.1110. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAPf:

H.J. Res.1111. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res.1112. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res.1113. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 500. Resolution authorizing expenditures incurred by the Special Commit­tee to Investigate Campaign Expendi­tures to be paid from the contingent fund of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and several referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R.11929. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R.11930. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Engle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R.11931. A bill for the relief of Luigi Renzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R.11932. A bill for the relief of Gregoire Karalla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALY:

H.R.11933. A bill for the relief of Constantin Papagiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R.11934. A bill for the relief of Nasralla Aziz Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R.11935. A bill for the relief of Laura Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R.11936. A bill for the relief of Claire A. Zarur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALY:

H.R.11937. A bill for the relief of Eida Bertolotti Lazaronc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R.11938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Haila Landa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R.11939. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jette Boyd Greer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R.11940. A bill to amend the relief of Ioannis Kanelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R.11941. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ibrahim Paruk Sarco, his wife, Fatma Nukhet, his two daughters, Ayse Hulp, Sara and Fatma Nil Sarco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VETERA:


By Mr. HAMM: H.R.11943. A bill for the relief of Miss Katherine Caricatik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Pioneer Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the great State of Alaska have a particular interest in being concerned with any activity or ceremony affecting Pan American World Airways. That is why I take great pleasure in joining with my other colleagues in commemorating the memorable and significant event in the history of Pan American World Airways, consisting of its successful inaugural flight across the Atlantic.

Residents of Alaska, Mr. Speaker, recall all too clearly the horror which struck our State last March. Well do we remember the immediate, enthusiastic, and unselfish response of Pan American in making available its equipment and extensive facilities to alleviate continued suffering in Alaska.

Commercial jet transportation played an important role in helping Alaska back to its feet after the Good Friday earthquake. When the docks at Seward and Whittier were demolished, Pan American Airways' jet clippers began carrying average cargo loads of 6 to 9 tons every night to Fairbanks.

One passenger jet carried 23,826 pounds of badly needed supplies to Alaska—one of the heaviest cargo loads ever transported on a passenger aircraft.

Part of this record load was 9,000 pounds of fresh milk. Foods and other perishables make up a heavy proportion of each jet flight, augmented by drugs, clothing, and other necessities.

Passenger traffic for the weeks following the earthquake reflected the resurgence of the 49th State, with a 41 percent gain for Pan American during April over the same month of 1963.

 Destruction of the docks at Seward and Whittier posed a major threat to the entire Alaska coastal area. The evacuation was not directly affected by the earthquake. Port facilities at these two cities serve as important gateways to Alaska for surface cargo, shipped in bulk or containers.

From these points, cargo is transported on the Alaska Railroad for carriage into the Interior. Following the earthquake, Alaska had the alternative of bringing in vitally needed goods via the long hard truck haul along the Alaskan Highway or by a 3-hour nonstop jet Clipper flight.

Although cargo volume doubled almost overnight the capacity of Pan Am's Boeing 707 jet clippers was so great that no backlog of cargo developed except for the first few days immediately following the earthquake.

While the entire community was dependent on air transportation for fresh produce and dairy products, Pan Am's highly nonstop flights to Fairbanks provided a 1,520-mile aerial supply line.

During the emergency, Seattle and Fairbanks airport personnel referred to Pan Am's nightly jet flight 901 as the "flying milkwagon" because of the large amounts of fresh milk and dairy products that went aboard each evening.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that Pan American, who pioneered service to Alaska in 1931, will be serving our great State for an indefinite period of time. We certainly hope so and we anticipate that its services will be maintained, not solely for emergency purposes, but to bring to the great State of Alaska many thousands of our fellow Americans who have never been exposed to the magnificence and beauty of the northernmost State in this Union.

Let Freedom Ring: July 4, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the 188th Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1964, the members of the American National Cowbelles—an auxiliary of the American National Cattlemen's Association—have sponsored the presentation of tiny cow bells to each Member of Congress to observe Independence Day by the ringing of bells across the Nation.

Since the initial effort to revive this American custom of ringing bells by patriotic citizens throughout the Nation in Nebraska, the American Legion has sponsored a nationwide program to enlist communities to ring school and church bells at a specified time. It has been enthusiastically received.

I can think of no better time than the present for each of us to reflect upon the freedoms we hold so dear and to renew our personal dedication to continue our American way-of-life in the face of growing threats from all sides.

We should rekindle in the hearts of all our citizens a feeling of pride and patriotism such as that felt by our forefathers when the first Independence Day was celebrated or when this young Nation withstood trials and emerged stronger and more prosperous than before.

I join with the members of the National Cowbelles and invite you to "ring the bells on the 4th of July."

"My country, 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty, Of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, Land of the pilgrims' pride, From every mountainside Let freedom ring."

—Samuel Francis Smith, 1808-95.

National Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nation's Capital and the Congressional Country Club were host to one of the world's prime sporting events, the 64th Open Championship of the U.S. Golf Association.

Golf fans who witnessed the National Open this year, either on the scene at the Congressional Country Club or via television, were privileged to see the greatest chapter in the long history of this event. In every respect, from the hospitality given visitors by the community and the club to the thrilling climax of the tournament itself, this 64th National Open was the finest of them all.

For this success we can thank Frank J. Murphy, Jr., general chairman of the tournament. It was Mr. Murphy's initiative, planning, and dedication that brought the 64th Open to Washington and the Congressional Country Club, and assured its flawless operation during tournament week. Appreciation must also be expressed to A. E. (Lon) Martin, club manager, and to all the officials and employees of the Congressional who contributed so much to making the Open a success.

And, of course, no one will ever be able to mention the 64th National Open