PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:
H.R. 7677. A bill for the relief of Georgios V. Bournos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADSMAS:
H.R. 7675. A bill for the relief of Victor Lu Hung Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

By Mr. FLOOD:
H.R. 7678. A bill for the relief of Miss Amelia Salvaterra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATERN:
H.R. 7677. A bill for the relief of Inger J. Ladegaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7678. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nathaniel Y. Cusulopling, and his wife, Dr. Lourdes Cusulopling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7679. A bill for the relief of Isaac Foulds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 7680. A bill for the relief of Miesseil Matsuya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:
H.R. 7681. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Passamaquoddy Project To Harness the Tides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I warned that the plans of Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, for connecting all Western Federal power lines into one gigantic “grid of grief” constituted a “Kilowatt Kremlin” for the United States. Now I see where he has recommended the expenditure of $800 million of the taxpayers’ money on the Passamaquoddy project in Maine to harness the tides.

This project would only be in use for some 200 hours a year, which constitutes a cost of some $1 million per year. If this project were feasible, it would be another matter. Yet countless recommendations, the last in 1961, have declared the project feasible. Canada has refused to participate in the entire project—but Udall has brought them in through the backdoor by saying that we will build it and they will have to buy the power generated from the operation.

It would seem that politics has entered into what should be dispassionate consideration of projects on their own merit. Since a Democratic Senator is up for reelection in Maine next year, the taxpayers must pay for a nearly $1 billion boondoggle because of Secretary Udall’s zealous activity to ride roughshod over private interests and similar Government control through both power plays and land grabs.

This power project has been suggested by Mr. Udall along with Federal land grabs ranging from the Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan to Assataque Island in Maryland which would dispossess thousands of private businessmen, landowners and homeowners with little or no justification. The only justification for such projects has been Mr. Udall’s statements that we must think big and act big. To me all this means is that Americans must pay big—for projects using the people’s money to build a political empire and to compete with private power companies and our free enterprise system. One thing Secretary Udall did not learn in Russia was to let “sleeping bears” lie.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, and I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating this significant event.

Seven years have passed since the dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe during 1956 focused public attention on the plight of the 100 million people behind the Iron Curtain. For us in the free world the events of 1956 proved to be an excessive charge made for housing occupied by families in the metropolitan areas, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable Enrico C. Bonner, for sponsoring the bill H.R. 7628; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

as during the uprising of 1956. Development in the Communist satellites since then have brought us to realize that the eventual liberation of these captive peoples will probably result from evolution instead of revolution. It must be our task to further this process by constantly voicing our concern for their fate and by encouraging greater autonomy from the Kremlin. Above all, we must maintain our steadfast dedication to the goal expressed in President Kennedy’s Captive Nations Week proclamation—the fulfillment of “the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.”

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the history of tyranny holds no greater story of oppression, for size, extent and cruelty, than that of the peoples we designate as captive nations. No colonial power or combination of powers has ever touched the scale of enslavement like that by which the harsh hand of colonial communism directly grasps the lives of nearly half the world and threatens the peace and welfare of the other half.

The brutal Communist suppression of human rights is the central political and moral fact in the world today. It is this fact which underlies all the basic tensions suffered by the world and parades and hobbies all international efforts to seek peace. It is my conviction that peace will be impossible until this dark influence is overcome and our free people can breathe free air again, in charge of their own destinies. At this time in history, we should be wary of Soviet ventures into friendliness with us. We know all too well by fear of the divisions in their own camp. We ought
to proceed with caution lest we be entrapped by the cordiality of the Russian bear; and lest we find we have bartered away the cause of the captive nations and gravely compromised our own.

It is well that we observe Captive Nations Week as a reminder that is both sorrowful and chilling. We, in this House of free institutions, should make every effort to keep this event high in the minds of our negotiators who are at this moment, in the midst of Captive Nations Week, engaged in cordial meetings with the Soviets in Moscow itself. The ever-growing list of captive nations should serve to show what the friendly Soviets really have in mind for us. Each of these names is associated with a great national history and with the eternal battle for human freedom: Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Russia, Rumania, East Germany, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Iceland, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba.

In Washington DC, International Race
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. D. B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record, a statement which I have prepared on the Washington, D.C. International Race Day in the United States, the unique Washington, D.C. International Race will be presented to the sporting people of the world for August 19th time. As each year becomes history, global interest shows a decided increase, not only among the peoples of the world who breed, own and race thoroughbreds, but also by racing's millions who thoroughly enjoy keen competition everywhere. Perhaps Vice President Lyndon Johnson best expressed the thought in a congratulatory telegram to Laurel president John D. Schapiro, in which he said: "You may well be proud of this people-to-people sports event for its role in furthering understanding among nations of the true world. Best wishes for success in the years to come."

From its beginning 11 years ago, the Washington, D.C. International held at Laurel Maryland, has been represented by Britain's leading thoroughbreds in Laurel's great International race and has won off the first victory in 1952. Recognition of the caliber of this classic can be seen, I believe, in the fact that both Her Majesty the Queen and Sir Winston Churchill have sent their horses to compete. Congratulations on an event that follows the 'Olympic' pattern of sports competition among nations.

Anatoly Dobrynin, the Ambassador of U.S.S.R., "There are so many things which the peoples of the world have in common; and one of them is the love of good sport. For this reason, the Washington, D.C. International Race is strengthening the bonds of friendship and cooperation among nations. We of the Soviet Union are most proud to have had our thoroughbreds participate in the past four runnings of this great classic."

The 11th running of the Washington, D.C. International marked the first appearance of a Japanese thoroughbred in the race. However, across-the-sea between Japan and the United States, the Laurel Race Course is not limited to the international race alone, for each year during Laurel's spring meeting, a Mikimoto Trophy is presented to the winner of the Laurel "Cherry Blossom Purse." In addition to enlarging the roster of international runners past the finish line, Laurel, D.C. International has run the annual "Jewel of the World," a horse selected by the Washington, D.C. International Committee in honor of the Laurel "Cherry Blossom Purse."
June 4, 1963.

Re passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman FLOOD: As a first generation American of Armenian ancestry, I am writing to you to let you know how much I appreciate the favorable action of the above bill submitted by you sometime in 1960.

Although it is very encouraging to know that some measure of relief is planned by men in your position to bring to view the grasping and tyrannical hand of the Soviet Union with regard to certain nations such as Armenia, it is very discouraging to have this bill bottled up by the Rules Committee. At this time, I am also writing to the Rules Committee urging the release of this bill to the House floor.

I know you will continue to maintain your stand on behalf of the passage of this bill.

Very truly yours,

Miss Rose Moorianian.

Congressman Howard W. Smith, Chairman, House Rules Committee, House of Representatives Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: Congressman Flood submitted House Resolution 14 to the House Rules Committee. As to date this resolution is still in the committee on a shelf. Would you please give your support and put this resolution on the floor for debate as it would help all the captive nations under the Communist regime to gain their freedom.

Being of Armenian descent we know what our parents are going through living under such regime.

Please give this matter a consideration as it means a lot to people who have relatives living in the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

JUD W. JEFFCOY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.
HOM. REPRESENTATIVES.

Mrs. Marie Pucorszka.
Secretary.

Mr. Walter Tustaniskv, Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Friends: Thank you for your letter urging submission of House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

At the present time this bill is pending before the House Committee on Rules with no action scheduled.

Let me assure you this measure has my support and I will continue to do all I can to see that it is enacted.

Sincerely yours,

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.
Member of Congress.


EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH, OF INDIANA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the Record a speech by

H. CONG. RES. 14, being the act to establish a special committee on captive nations. This committee has been in existence since 1952. The purpose of the committee is to study the problem of the captive nations and to bring to the attention of the American people the plight of these nations.

The committee has held numerous hearings and has received numerous reports from various experts on the subject. The committee has also made numerous recommendations to the House of Representatives and to the Senate.

The committee has been very active in its work and has done much to bring the problem of the captive nations to the attention of the American people.

The committee has been very successful in its work and has done much to bring the problem of the captive nations to the attention of the American people.
our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, John Brademas, which was delivered at the Captive Nations Week dinner, July 17, 1963, here in Washington.

Indiana was pointed out by the Assembly of Captive Nations Week Dinner, July 17, 1963, National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

It is a great pleasure for me to accept this award on behalf of Gov. Matthew Welsh and the people of Indiana.

The citizens of my State are proud that, because of the actions of our delegation in Congress, of our Governor and State legislature, of the press and many community organizations, Indiana has been chosen to receive this honor from the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

I must say, however, that support for the oppressed peoples of the world seems to me a cause for special commendation than a nationality of all freedom-loving men and women.

I want to salute the Assembly of Captive European Nations Week and extend our congratulations to the dedicated leadership in dramatizing the plight of the millions throughout the world, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere, who live their lives under the tyranny of Communist rule.

I have the honor to represent in Congress many thousands of persons whose origins are in the nations now captive in Eastern Europe. Indeed, only last fall I had an opportunity to visit two of these countries, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

In the gray mist of the ancient city of Prague, I saw the grim and deeding effect of Stalinism. Even the street lights of Prague were dim and flickering as if to reflect the despair of a people without freedom.

In Warsaw and Krakow and Czestochowa, I felt, in conversations with writers and teachers and students, the intense desire of the Poles to rid their minds with the fear out of the mind of the information or the knock on the door.

Suddenly, that desire is permitted to burn more brightly in Poland than elsewhere in Eastern Europe, but even now the Gomulka government is providing great encouragement to conformity, seeking to snuff out the dangerous fires of free thought.

I have been as well in Moscow and Leningrad and Kiev the trappings of the modern Communist state and observed what it does to narrow and confine and distort the lives of human beings.

And I have seen, as many of you have seen, and as President Kennedy saw last month, the wall of shame that divides the great city of Berlin.

As President Kennedy told that vast outpouring of human beings, there are many people in the world who really don't understand, or say they don't, what the great issue between the East and the West.

"Let them come to Berlin," he said.

It is with some feeling therefore that I would venture one proposition to you tonight. This is this—that the case of the captive nations must never be conceived as a problem apart from the mainstream of free world policy.

The struggle.

For we are engaged in a global struggle involving the fundamentals of our faith as a freedom-loving people and the destiny of millions of peoples now living under Communist dictatorships is a crucial factor in that struggle.

Therefore, even as Averell Harriman, a tried and tested and tough expert in dealing with the Soviets, talks with them in Moscow about the best options, we must maintain our commitment to a powerful military defense and to a foreign policy that will seize every opportunity to press for freedom for millions now living under Communist dictatorship.

Let us be soberly aware of the threat of nuclear destruction. To fail in this awareness would be the height of irresponsibility. Yet let us be equally aware that the task of achieving freedom for peoples is no less significant or compelling.

We must then never agree with the Communist World against the Western World. Indeed, only last fall I had an opportunity to see Berlin, a symbol of the struggle and the holiday of the Eastern Europe.

Yet no man has an easy prescription for resolving the extraordinary and complex problems with which we must confront the horizon of freedom. I believe, however, that in Eastern Europe, one of the most critical areas in the struggle for freedom, there are signs in that country to an uncontrollable blow.

For as President Kennedy said last month in his great speech at the Free University of Berlin, "the wall of shame that divides the great city of Berlin"—which, indeed, only last fall I had an opportunity to see Berlin, a symbol of the struggle and the holiday of the East—now and must continue to be aimed at the ultimate and complete freedom of the peoples caged behind the Iron Curtain.

What are some of these signs of change to which the President referred?

First, we are now witnessing the deepening and savage warfare between Moscow and Peking for authority over the Communist world. If what I sense is mere shadow play would be to ignore the obvious. Of course, to suggest that the Sino-Soviet split solves all our problems would be foolishness. But there is now, and must continue to be aimed at the ultimate and complete freedom of the peoples caged behind the Iron Curtain.

Second, there are many signs of troubles within the captive nation.

Gomulka has postponed the Polish Party Congress for the year for fear it might bring the struggles between warring factions in that country to an uncontrollable boil.

The Hungarian regime has resisted the Moscow-conceived plans for the Soviet economic block.

Clearly, therefore, distress signals are coming out of Czechoslovakia, the longest holdout against even slight deviations from Stalinist rigidity.

The Communist economy.

Third, we are witnessing the increasing contrast between a faltering Communist economic system in Eastern Europe and a growing, vigorous economy in Western Europe. We may be legitimately concerned about the step-by-step advance of the new European economic community and about American power in the West as a contrast view free Europe alongside totalitarian Europe without concluding that the future belongs to the free.

And finally, our hope can reside as firmly as ever in that most constant force for freedom, the peoples of Eastern Europe and their spirit of protest against Communist oppression—a spirit of courage and quiet determination so well known that I need not dwell on it here.

Clearly, the Communist ship in Eastern Europe is floating on a sea of troubles.

We should be searching for imaginatively exploiting these troubles to press the Communists for a greater degree of economic freedom in their captive nations wherever and whenever there is a prudent and reasonable expectation that our efforts to do so can be effective.

Hon. John S. Monagan Addresses Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF W. J. BRYAN DORN OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, July 18, 1963)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 the Assembly of Captive European Nations honored our distinguished colleagues, Rep. John E. Ryan and Mr. John S. Monagan, at the annual banquet commemorating the observance of Captive Nations Week. Mr. Monagan was presented a plaque and a combination of
the flags of the captive European nations, together with a citation in sincere gratitude for his steadfast furtherance of the freedom aspirations of the captive nations.

We are well aware of Congressman MoNAGAN's effective efforts and accomplishments in chairing the hearings on the captive European nations held by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I was privileged to hear his comments at the awards dinner and I wish at this time to call them to the attention of my countrymen at this time in the history of the Assembly of captive nations which he eloquently presented at the dinner in his honor.


Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen,

I am deeply honored to receive this award from the Assembly of Captive European Nations, which I believe demonstrates that that group and combination of the flags of the captive European nations will be a treasured possession and an inspiration to their people.

I am particularly honored to be linked in these exercises with the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator Kefauver, and the distinguished Senator from my own State, my dear friend, Senator Dome. I am also honored that my colleague and friend from Indiana, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, is here for today's program, as well as the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, and the equally distinguished commentator, Edgar Mowrer.

It is a particular honor to be invited to join, in 1903, the long list of outstanding Americans who over the years have lent their support to the movement to give aid and encouragement to the people of the captive countries of Europe.

It is vitally important that the activity of your committee and of the various friends of the captive nations be continued because the need for this support is as great today as it ever has been. This task is complicated by the fact that there are all kinds of arguments advanced through the use of the double-talk in which conditions in some of the captive nations have been materially improved. In addition, the Western World is increasingly finding some basis upon which there might be agreement between the East and the West to outlaw thermonuclear war. It seems to be one of the consequences of friction that have hitherto existed. The uninformed and those with short memories might be inclined to be unduly optimistic about the future and, therefore, to be disposed to gloss over the still remaining difficulties of the present.

It is here, precisely, that the Committee on the Captive Nations performs its function. It can and does call attention to the facts. It can prevent the thaw, contrary to what is being said, in all of the captive nations as far from those in the free world as day from night. There are still political prisoners. Religion is harassed. Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Beran are still virtual prisoners. Intellectuals and cultural activities are kept under control. The elections are not free. Trade discrimination is practiced on a broad scale against the captive countries. Armed Communist troops, in the tens of thousands, are still stationed in Hungary. The threat of armed Russian intervention is always present.

As human beings, we must continue to sympathize with the fate of these hapless people of the free world who are fighting to gain control of their own countries over the free world, and whose love of freedom is no less than our own.

All of us, I am sure, were heartened by the strong and stirring statements about the people behind the Iron Curtain which President John F. Kennedy made recently in Berlin and in Dublin. He spoke of the impossibility of doing business with the Communists as demonstrated in Berlin, and he encouraged the continuation of resistance by the captive nations along the lines of the conduct of the Irish during their long struggle against English rule.

Let us hope that the acts of our Government representatives, contrary to the unfortunate resolutions of a majority of their colleagues at the United Nations, will, in the future, reflect these challenging words of the President of the United States.

It was our conclusion that support of the captive nations should not flag nor lessen. We felt that a lessening of freedom anywhere meant a lessening of freedom everywhere.

We concluded that tyranny and oppression that have been identified should be proclaimed to the world and we felt that the United States should champion the cause of the oppressed people and on every occasion to parade their oppression in front of the world.

In accepting this honor tonight, which represents a recognition of the efforts of others as well as my own, I pledge the continued support of the people of the captive nations in the hope that one day our children will be able to have the opportunity to work together, when these people, in their own homes, will enjoy the same privileges which are ours today.

Taxes: Exempt and Otherwise


Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the tax cut issue is high on the agenda at this time for congressional action. Some notes of interest have a top priority in the arguments for and against.

The problem, as I see it, is not one of lack of jobs and income producing opportunities but rather one of bad distribution. We seem to be getting into a situation in less than 200 years that it took European countries centuries to achieve.

We are gradually putting all our wealth into the hands of a few families who in turn are now actively seeking full political as well as complete economic control over the whole U.S. economy. In fact, there is a growing suspicion that their aims go further and the full control of world economy between top U.S. inherited wealth and prestige is lining up with an all-out attempt to use this country under the slogan and doubletalk of "world peace," "brotherhood," "humanitarianism," "free trade," "aid to the underprivileged," and so forth.

Now understand this clearly, I believe all of us—good or bad, low or high—are interested in these aims, all of us in the main want to be good, friendly, and helpful to those in need.

In fact, most of us do these things and promote our aims from a viewpoint of Christian principles while others doubletalk, doublecross, and alibi.

The world's economics are based on an economic axis and until we can get all people to realize that work of some kind must be performed by all of us in order to serve the common good, these aims will be frustrated and the world will be left out of some and princes out of others.

For instance, here in the United States we have 1 percent of all U.S. adults owning over 1 percent of all the personal wealth in the Nation. This same 1 percent of our adults actually represent only about one-half of 1 percent of our total population and yet they hold 76 percent of all the savings and investments of all State and local tax exempt bonds.

This means that all the billions of dollars of local and State personal income producing obligations are scot free in order. In fact, it is true that those having $50,000 income earned would pay about $23,000 in income taxes but by buying tax exempts he pays nothing.

The same person putting his money into stock and investment that are taxable would pay $12,500 taxes.

You can see why the 1 percent of heads of families in the United States own all the tax-exempt bonds while the workingmen and lower income bracket earners of $10,000 or less pay taxes on 90 percent of their earnings at the highest rate of taxation.

In the case of the tax cut, the law calls for a 91 percent tax on a million dollar income, the average paid is only 28 percent because of loopholes, exemptions, and so forth.

In 1960, out of the entire national income, after taxes, 20 percent of the richest people got 44 percent while 80 percent or the rest of all the people got 56 percent of all the income.

It is not a socialist plan or even a radical plan to have all citizens pay their share of taxes. When we have gimmicks the only thing that happens is that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

Only 2 percent of total U.S. income was received by 7 million families while 3½ million families received 23 percent of total income. These facts are sobering to those amongst us who are worried about chronic unemployment and the situation as outlined by Leon Keyserling, chief economic adviser under Truman, whose studies show 40 percent of all Americans living in poverty and deprivation.

It is true that this poverty group is hidden because it is scattered over our 50 States but it is there, and here, even if we tax at the rate of the wealthy man ly ing and a report made recently to the President by a special group studying our economy, we may have more underprivileged than some nations we are pouring aid into.

Another false, double talk propaganda line, by the well-heeled lobby for the privileged taxpayers is that if greater
tax breaks are given to high, upper-bracket incomes, it will stimulate investment and, in turn, create more employment.

How silly can we get, all of us—those who promote such tripe and those of us who believe it?

How can any sound argument be made for such a silly economic fallacy when we now have over 17 percent of our production capacity idle and millions unemployed? The answer is not produced at this stage, but rather income and consumption.

Automation can be a blessing but when it is used to cut out labor, produce surpluses, and increase the top profit brackets and incomes, it is a curse on the body politic. It causes more unemployment, higher taxes on the poor people, lessens consumption, for as one economist said:

I've never seen an automat get its shirt cleaned, get a shave, have a lawyer, see a doctor, or sit down to eat the produce of our farms.

We have reached a crossroad in our economy and a decision must be made. Either we put people to work producing goods and services, create purchasing power, and enable the masses to develop into a two-class society, those who are lucky enough to inherit wealth and prestige and the rest of us who will live in a restricted income economy like the rest of the世界上where the inheritor of wealth and prestige have lived in luxury while the main body of the populace lived in hand-to-mouth existence.

My parents and millions more ran away from the closed societies of the old countries and if this generation of their offspring allows this to happen here in the greatest land of opportunity ever created by man, then their hopes for peace, friendship and brotherly consideration amongst the peoples of all nations will be as dead as the proverbial dodo bird.

Even in the so-called broad based taxes such as excise, sales and use taxes, the little fellow carries the load.

The tax on the lower brackets spent 92 to 94 cents of our income on goods and services while those in the upper brackets spent less than 26 cents out of a dollar.

This means that a 5-percent sales tax is about 4½-percent effective on the lower income group while it is only about a 1½-percent tax upon the high incomes. The truth of the matter is that instead of spreading our income in a fashion that would insure the greatest possible market basket distribution we are gradually but surely wiping out the leveling in our society, aided by the middle income earner, a phenomenon peculiar to the U.S. economy and most responsible for our economic, civic, and political growth.

Every year sees less and less workers climbing out of the ditch, becoming self-employed and employers in their own right. The day of the self-made man and unlimited horizons appears to have been lost. It is nullified under the inheritors of exorbitant tax-exempt wealth.

No single business can be saved if one of our large monopolistic-type industries, chain stores or fabrication, wants to take it over. Antitrust antimonopoly laws become useless in our domestic economy because of the internationalization of production. Producers, importers, exporters, and processors must decide, of necessity, if they seek survival in world markets, become part of the foreign cartels and combines, syndicates and state-controlled production and distribution systems.

Recently we witnessed the takeover of U.S. foreign-based investments in many countries by foreign interests. Like in Cuba, were taken over without compensation, others in Brazil were supposed to be paid for while many are just being taxed out of U.S. control.

The latest country to show its economic fangs to the profiteering U.S. companies who have subsidiaries in foreign countries for many reasons not the least of which is to pay the lowest tax concessions and a haven away from U.S. income taxes, is our neighbor, Canada.

I quote from the U.S. News, June 24, 1963:

"Tax penalties are to be applied to U.S. corporations that operate subsidiaries in Canada. Canada's new budget calls definitely for a "Canada first" policy in industry.

Here are the highlights:

A "takeover tax" of 30 percent is to apply to holdings of Canadian stocks and assets to foreigners. This amounts to a hefty sales tax on transactions that transfer control from U.S. to Canadian hands and other outside firms. Tax is effective immediately for companies listed on Canadian stock exchange.

A cut tax is offered to companies that are 25 percent owned by Canadians. Withholding tax on dividends to nonresidents in these firms drops from 15 to 10 percent, immediately.

A tax boost is scheduled on dividends paid by companies that are less than 25 percent owned by Canadians. Rate goes from 15 to 20 percent on January 1, 1965.

A 15-percent withholding tax is levied on management fees paid by Canadian firms to nonresidents.

Accelerated depreciation rates will be available only to companies with a minimum of 25 percent Canadian ownership. This means to 50 percent on new machinery and equipment.

Tax refunds from the 20-percent levy will be made if, by January 1967, the foreign-controlled firms become 25 percent Canadian-owned.

To add insult to injury the Canadians are going to drive U.S. investors out of control of companies in Canada while at the same time they will drive U.S. investors to buy bonds and debt issues of Canadian companies where these investments are purely investment paper without voting rights.

Another quote from U.S. News:

"The budget also contains a device to attract U.S. purchases of bonds and other debt issues of Canadian companies. Tax-exempt organizations, such as pension trusts and foundations, will be given tax-free privileges in Canada. Major aim of Canada's new budget is to reduce U.S. influence in Canada's industrial operations. Nonresidents, most of them from the United States, are paid to control 97 percent of Canada's manufacturing, 61 percent of mining and smelting, 76 percent of oil and gas.

Some large U.S. companies are to be affected by Canada's new tax laws. Examples: Ford Motor Co. of Canada; Motors of Canada; Canadian International Paper, a subsidiary of International Paper, Canada; General Electric, Du Pont of Canada, Coca-Cola, Ltd. All of these Canadian companies are more than 76 percent owned by U.S. firms.

Canada wants U.S. capital in the future to be in the form of bonds and debt issues, rather than common stocks.

This program is not new nor is it an isolated case of foreign objection to U.S. control. It is a common occurrence and will become even more the rule as days go by and these foreign countries have their industries in production with the U.S. market handed to them by our idiotic trade deals.

Again, I quote from the U.S. News:

"American investments in Europe's Common Market are to get a critical study by the Market's executive commission. Finance ministers of the six Common Market countries agreed on June 11 that the study should be made to get a better idea of how the U.S. industries are operating and of the foreign investments in food processing and in the oil industry.

One French fear is that expanding American investments in France may interfere with that country's economic planning.

As you can see, the whole world is commercially minded when it comes to trade. Every nation must lock out for its peoples, its institutions, first, and still give to all others whatever does not deny its peoples their rights, their opportunities and, above all, their means of earning a livelihood.

Most of us realize the need for employment, but few of us have the answers or perhaps the position of power to put our proposals into action.

We alone will tell whether we can continue to have unemployment, increased automation, surplus, subsidies, and free trade all at the same time without breaking our banks or our collective economic needs.

NATIONWIDE OBSERVANCE OF COLUMBUS DAY
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Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that October 12 of each year be recognized as a legal holiday for the whole Nation, to be known as Columbus Day.

In proposing that we observe October 12 as a national holiday I am not suggesting the establishment of merely another occasion or excuse to celebrate. I believe that Columbus Day should be
He knew that he wanted to prove that the discrimination against dark-skinned people could be established with Asia.

If not for his indomitable spirit, his steadfast faith in divine guidance to inaugurate a new era in human affairs, and the prior rights of parents to direct the education of their children, we still have a long way to go before we can attain genuine peace, justice, and human dignity for all. We have not only the problems of today to consider, but we must also think of the world of tomorrow in which our children are destined to live and we must be prepared to meet the problems and the unknown dangers of the future.

In the perspective of history, we think of Columbus as a dedicated man who inspired countless generations, and will continue to inspire other generations to conquer the unknown and to advance human rights and the principles of freedom of choice and parental rights principles. This legislation provides for a Federal aid to education bill which had been prepared by the NEA on two grounds:

1. The bill made no provision for some 7 million American children attending independent schools, thereby discriminating against them in violation of the equal protection clause of the Constitution.

2. This bill was part of a plan by NEA to set up a monopolistic educational system controlled by the Federal Government and based on the atheistic concept of man. At that time I called the attention of the American people to a brochure entitled "Federal Education Agency for the Future" which fully supported my views.

At that time I stated: "I shall not vote for legislative discrimination." I also stated "diversity is the quintessence of democracy. Uniformity is the hallmark of totalitarianism." On these principles I still stand.

Early in 1962 in the 87th Congress I introduced a bill based on the freedom of choice and parental rights principles. This bill has been reintroduced in the 88th Congress by me and bears number H.R. 530. The bill has also been introduced in the House and Senate by Congressmen Carey and Halverson, of New York, and Hawkins, of California, and is pending in the House Committee on Education and Labor. My bill recognizes the natural, civil, and constitutional right of parents to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. It is interesting to note that the most recent encyclical of Pope John XXIII also proclaims the prior rights of parents to direct the education of their children. Pope John said: "The natural right of human beings has the right to respect for their person. To his good reputation. The right to freedom in seeking for truth and in communicating this opinion, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good. And he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events. "The natural law also gives man the right to share in the benefits of culture, and
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Mr. DELANEY. Article was printed in "The Federal Aid to Education-Present State of the Question," by Hon. James J. Delaney, New York, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 14, 1963.
therefore the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development of the country to which he belongs. Every other country has the right to see that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on to higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills which have been acquired.

Pope John also said: "Parents, however, have a prior right in the support and education of their children."

My bill is modeled on the GI bill of rights, whose provisions are generally well known to the American public. I stated at the time when I first introduced this bill “the bill merely follows the approach of the GI bill of rights and the page boys bill, both of which have worked successfully and without criticism. It is the commonsense solution to this problem.”

Two years ago there was a lack of clear understanding; there was question of the constitutionality of aid to students attending nonpublic schools insofar as the public contribution for religious purposes. A similar bill, which has occurred within the past 2 years has dissolved the fog of doubt which existed there. Public schools in the States learned that the Federal Government, even before the adoption of the Constitution, in the Northwest Ordinance, made provisions for aid to all educational institutions including theological seminaries. Since the Northwest Ordinance, the Federal Government has made grants of land to all of the land-grant colleges, which included church-related colleges and even theological seminaries. Following the Civil War, the Federal Government set up Howard University in Washington, D.C., and has supported it from that day to this. Howard University maintains a theological seminary although under the Federal law, which has been on the statute books for three quarters of a century, no portion of the moneys granted by the Congress goes to support the theological seminary.

It is interesting to note that the State of New York, at the same time that the Northwest Ordinance was enacted, also set up a similar provision known as Gospel Lots and Gospel Funds which provided that in the distribution of public lands in upstate New York that every local community in the State would set aside from the land-grant to support the law, church and school. These Gospel Lots and Gospel Funds are still perpetuated in the education law of the State of New York also applicable to many upstate communities are still receiving benefits from them.

It is also interesting to note that in New York, St. Peter's Roman Catholic School on Barclay Street received aid from the State of New York in 1866, and further that Governor Seward in 1840, in his annual message to the legislature, recommended State aid to church-related schools.

At present there are a large number of educational programs on the college level, where the Federal Government makes grants, either direct to the institution, or to students attending and church-related colleges. In addition, the Federal Government maintains a military educational program, known as the ROTC in which all church-related colleges are eligible to participate.

It is interesting to note that the ROTC program, known as the GI bill of rights, which is applicable to GI's attending any secondary or schools of their choice. Throughout the country many GI's attended secondary schools of their choice and their tuition was paid for by the Government under the GI bill of rights. Under the various junior ROTC programs all secondary schools, whether church related or not, are eligible to receive grants from the Federal Government. The page boys bill, which provides that the Federal Government shall pay the education of page boys of the Supreme Court and the Congress also applies to primary, secondary and church-related schools.

It is not necessary to be a constitutional lawyer to realize that the church-related schools were here first and that the Federal Government, from its inception, has down to, and including the present time, made provisions for students attending independent or church-related schools.

In fact, in the present bill before the Congress, H.R. 3000, the provisions thereof which deal with higher education are not discriminatory and make fair and equal provision for all students and all educational institutions. In H.R. 3000 it fails to follow the principles of the other provisions of the bill and undertakes, on the contrary, to make equal provision only for State managed schools and makes no provision for independent schools privately maintained.

The GI Medical Schools Act, which passed the House of Representatives within the past few weeks, also makes equal provisions for church-related medical schools.

In the last 2 years innumerable constitutional authorities and law review articles throughout the country, have pointed clearly that there is no constitutional bar on the Federal level for giving aid to all children attending all schools. The constitutional issue raised in many circles before 1860 as to the eligibility of a Catholic to be President of the United States. Such a constitutional question may sound strange today but only 3 years ago it was seriously debated.

There is no better way of guaranteeing freedom and democracy in education than by allowing each child, or his parent, to choose his own school. This is the educational policy of practically all of the countries of the free world excepting our own. Of course I am not saying that there is only one system of education and that is controlled by the State as a monopoly. Some of our educational systems are as highly developed in the United States. They do not realize that secular education is limited education in the United States. The requirements of the compulsory education laws are satisfied by students attending independent schools privately managed. In other words, the independent schools serve the same public function as the State managed schools. All of these schools meet the educational requirements set up by the compulsory education laws of our States. They are part of the American educational system. However, the independent schools are not limited and usually add other subjects to their curriculum. It has been pointed out that during the First World War, when synthetic rubber was the Nation's greatest need, that synthetic rubber was not developed in secondary school, but rather was developed in Notre Dame University.

There are some who object to students attending any public school because they contend that the curriculum in these schools is permeated with religious or anti-religious bias. The Declaration of Independence will also reveal that the Declaration of Independence is in substance, a small summary of theology.

Does this mean that the Declaration of Independence cannot be read or taught in schools which receive public aid?

At the present time the largest single item in every State budget and in the budget of every local community in the United States is the provision for education. Large as these provisions are they are bound to progress in the future. The need for more education is due to three factors. One, increased costs of all items that go into education. Two, the large increase in population which started in 1942 and three, the need for more education for more children in order to meet the threat of world communism.

At the present time it costs, in the State of New York, approximately $600 per student, per annum, for elementary education and $800 per student, per annum, for secondary education. Roughly speaking the cost of education in the State of New York is distributed between the local community and the State. The State's share is reflected in income taxes and the local share is imposed upon real estate, which includes homes. My bill, which would give $20 per student to every student, including those attending independent and private schools, would be a great incentive for more independent and private schools and would to that extent relieve the taxpayers of a tremendous financial burden. This policy encourages private and independent groups, including religious groups, to support schools which meet the requirements of the compulsory education law and which save a considerable portion of the cost of educating American children.
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Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. At this time we reaffirm our commitment to an open and democratic society, we recall the ideals of freedom and independence which persist among those peoples crushed by the weight of the Iron Curtain.

Since the beginning of the Second World War, communism has made marked advances throughout the world. Yet Communist expansionism is not a phenomenon confined to the past two decades. Ever since 1917, the international Communist leadership has pursued an unscrupulous policy of aggrandizement. The first Soviet Commissar of Nationalities was Joseph Vissarionitch, and under his direction such newly independent states as Armenia and Georgia were, by treachery and by force, incorporated into the Soviet empire.

And it has continued for more than 40 years. The events of succeeding decades have been but further embroilery upon this web of aggression, aggression supposedly justified by the inevitable march of history. Since 1940, over 100 million people in Eastern Eu-
rope have been sucked into the Communist vortex. In not one instance has a Communist regime been established through the free and willing consent of a democratic majority. The techniques have been numerous: Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—outright invasion; Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania—political subversion; Albania—guerilla warfare; Bulgaria and Hungary—occupation by so-called Russian liberation forces, with the methods by which apocryphal people's governments have been established. Surely the inevitable course of history has something better to offer than this record.

Through the vigorous policies of President Truman and his successors, we have checked the brutal swing of the Red sickle in Europe. But now the Communist tide flows to the south and to the east.

In China there has arisen a monster which even its creators cannot control. Yet we must not interpret this growing split within the Communist camp as an ebbing of the tide. Whether it be the nuclear tactics of a Mao or the subversive tactics of a Khrushchev, the ultimate aim is still the same: to spread the shadow of darkness over the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, as we have demonstrated in the past 15 years, our Nation is irrevocably committed to stemming the wave of Sino-Soviet expansionism. But this is not sufficient—nor can it be, as long as 22 nations are bowed beneath the Communist yoke. The desire for freedom among these captive peoples remains great, as evidenced by the courageous uprising in Poland and Hungary in 1956, or the continuing exodus from East Germany, in spite of nearly insurmountable obstacles. It is to their liberation that we must further commit ourselves.

For almost 200 years, the United States has led the struggle for freedom and self-determination. But the Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman Doctrine—such documents attest to our continuing resolve to sustain the ideals of democracy. By observing Captive Nations Week, we reaffirm to the world that we still hold forth the beacon of liberty to all those who desire it. And until that day comes when those who draw the yoke of tyranny shall be free, let this week serve as a proclamation, that we do not forget.
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Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, in his superb statement on June 12 was not speaking for the South alone. Senator Russell was speaking for the American way of life in every sense of our Constitution, and the foundation stones upon which our civilization and this Republic are built.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the crossroads in our Nation. We have been making fantastic progress and now we either move straight ahead with a continuation of this progress with dignity and freedom or we plunge down a side road of violence, retrogression, and socialism. We either move forward under the Constitution and the written law or we turn the clock back to ignorance, chaos, and stark naked centralized power.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the entire Nation Senator Russell's statement as carried in the U.S. News & World Report of June 24.

THE SOUTH STATES ITS CASE

(Statement by Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, June 12, 1963)

Mr. Speaker, the South—Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia—now states the South's case against civil rights proposals. In a major policy statement issued after a conference of Southern Senators, Senator Russell said that Negroes proposed by President Kennedy would conflict with rights of other Americans and take the United States toward socialism. He promised to oppose administration plans with every means and resource.

The President's speech on June 11 appealed eloquently to the emotions but completely disregarded the experiences and true equality under the Constitution. The fact that every citizen has the same right to own and operate a swimming pool or dining hall constitutes equality. The use of Federal power to force the owner of a dining hall or swimming pool to unwillingly accept a new and special right for Negroes in derogation of the property rights of all of our people to own and control the fruits of their labor and ingenuity.

The outstanding distinction between a government established to secure individual or communistic state is the fact that free men can own and control property, whereas Stalinism denies property rights. From his ability and to each according to his need may have greater emotional appeal than "work hard to acquire a property of our own, and take care of our children..." However, Marxism has not worked and can never work because it does not take human nature into account. To rebuff the emotional appeal, we have the hard, undeniable fact that in our free-enterprise system we have plenty, whereas the Marxists—though they have never been able to apply literally their avowed creed—all suffer from scarcity and privation.

Our American system has always rejected the idea that one group of citizens may deprive another of legal rights in property by willy-nilly demonstration, intimidation, law defiance and civil disobedience. I do not believe that the American people will be easily frightened into disrupting our system for advantages dreamed that have been discredited wherever tried.

The highest office of the land should symbolize respect for American legal rights and not enact ordinances of the meanest hamlet in the land or the written word of our national dignity.

I was, therefore, shocked to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations, accompanied by violence against the public...