

White, John W.
 White, Richard P.
 Whitehurst, Garland B.
 Whitting, Robert M., Jr.
 Whitney, John W.
 Whitney, Richard M., Jr.
 Whitsett, John B.
 Wier, Ward W.
 Wilkes, Gilbert V., III
 Wilkinson, Robert B., Jr.
 Wilkinson, Chester H.
 Willetts, Leo J., Jr.
 Williams, Robert F.
 Williams, Dudley D., III
 Williams, Thomas B.
 Williams, Jack R.
 Williams, Norman M., Jr.
 Willimon, Henry P., Jr.
 Willman, Carl E.
 Wilmot, Frederick E.
 Wilson, Charles R.
 Wilson, Raymond J.
 Wilson, Robert B.
 Wilson, Robert L.
 Wilson, William B.
 Wimberley, Barry S.
 Winant, Thomas C.
 Winfree, Howard T.
 Wittmann, Bertrand R.
 Woehl, Robert D.
 Wolfe, Ned C.
 Womack, Thomas F.
 Wood, James E., III
 Wood, Richard E.
 Woods, Robert J.
 Woody, Joseph M.
 Worthington, George R.

SUPPLY CORPS

Akers, John R.
 Allbaugh, Charles U.
 Anderson, Thomas
 Anttila, Robert M.
 Atkinson, Joseph M.
 Barnes, Francis S.
 Bauer, James F.
 Benson, Fred B., IV
 Bird, Jon A.
 Bishop, William C.
 Bodour, Haig
 Booth, Henry A., Jr.
 Bratschi, Gilbert W.
 Bryan, Edward L.
 Callahan, Robert M.
 Campbell, John A., Jr.
 Carolan, Thomas R.
 Cavanaugh, Michael R.
 Ceder, Loren R.
 Chappell, Ralph L.
 Cooner, James J.
 Cozart, David J.
 Daeschner, William E.
 Danna, Peter J., Jr.
 Davis, John J.
 Dell, Jack V.
 DeMeester, Robert C.
 DeNeuf, Ronald B.
 Diener, Thomas E.
 Divis, James A.
 Draper, Walter S., IV
 Drees, John M.
 Dunlap, Clarence C.
 Ecklein, Ronald H.
 Edwards, David N.
 Endt, Henry J., Jr.
 Falconer, Douglas W.
 Fava, Ernest E.
 Fenick, Robert W.
 Fitch, James B.
 Foley, John W., Jr.
 Folsom, William B.
 Foltz, Ronald L.
 Gaines, James E.

Wright, Alan F.
 Wright, David J.
 Wulfinghoff, Donald R.
 Wyatt, David R.
 Wylie, Walter J.
 Yaeger, Charles J., Jr.
 Youmans, George E.
 Young, Stephen G.
 Youngblood, William W.
 Zalkan, Robert L.
 Zally, George D.
 Zaveruka, Michael P.
 Zayauskas, Leo V.
 Zinn, Clyde D.
 Benner, Sara L.
 Brown, Nancy A.
 Carroll, Miriam E.
 Coyer, Ann E.
 Feldes, Marcia A.
 Fischer, Judith
 Ivemeyer, Dorothy L.
 James, Mary C.
 Kulmus, Diane J.
 Lemmons, Maureen F.
 Leroy, Javotte A.
 Loser, Margit M.
 Lower, Jo A. H.
 Maddox, Vivienne D.
 Moore, Donna L.
 Pane, Marletta A.
 Pearson, Beverly A.
 Rathbun, Jane S.
 Read, Bonnie J.
 Rundie, Lynne E.
 Snodderly, Sandra L.
 Stege, Mary C.
 Thacker, Shirley A.
 Turman, Mary F.
 Tyndall, Sara M.
 Wagner, Patricia L.
 Weber, Elsie L.
 Wylie, Elizabeth G.

Matheny, Arthur L.
 Maxon, Bruce E.
 Mayfield, Lee M.
 Mays, Daniel R.
 McCaughey, Robert A.
 McCutchan, Robert D., Jr.
 McLaughlin, Robert J.
 McQuade, John P., III
 Mendez, Ramon E.
 Meyer, Joseph, Jr.
 Mielke, Kenneth W. R.
 Miller, James E.
 Miller, Robert E.
 Moore, William M., Jr.
 Morse, Gary A.
 Mullin, Alexander G.
 Nagle, Robert J.
 Nelson, Dennis C.
 Noel, Wilbert E.
 Nolan, John W.
 O'Donnell, Jeremiah T.
 O'Hare, Shamus J.
 Ostrom, Byron R.
 Overman, Douglas R.
 Pahud, Guy E.
 Pankey, Beverly S.
 Perdue, Robert C., Jr.
 Peterson, Ross W.
 Pitner, Wayne A.
 Prescott, Gordon W.
 Pryce, Richard J.
 Putney, Frederick B.
 Read, Neil A.
 Reed, William H.
 Rhodes, William D., Jr.
 Rogers, Allan B.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bell, Bruce E.
 Bell, Robert B., Jr.
 Belleson, James G.
 Bilden, Richard P.
 Block, Neil
 Bond, Myron H.
 Brennan, John P.
 Calkin, David A.
 Callender, Gordon W., Jr.
 Carden, Orlean R.
 Carter, Robert L.
 Chlogioji, Melvin H.
 Clarren, George
 Coston, Vernie R.
 Crumbley, Don C.
 Currie, Wayne L.
 Davis, John M.
 Dickson, John A., III
 Dixon, Phillip G.
 Doctor, Richard P.
 Farlow, David E.
 Fitzgerald, Dennis J., Jr.
 French, Richard G.
 Gilmore, Daniel R., Jr.
 Hindes, Robert S.
 Hoppe, Warren D. J.
 Kasner, Jon B.
 Kilday, Gary R.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Behling, Daniel W.
 Benedict, William H.
 Bergner, John F., Jr.
 Cassel, Dallas E.
 Chan, Robert S.
 Coxe, Robert F.
 Drodz, Joseph J., Jr.
 Duckett, Jack
 Funderburk, Lester R., Jr.
 Grothaus, Roger H.
 Hollman, Frederick L.
 Horrobin, Robert W.

Rubenstein, Andre M.
 Runey, Leroy J., Jr.
 Savage, Horace J.
 Schermerhorn, Michael I.
 Schroyer, Charles D.
 Schulz, Leonard W.
 Simpson, Raese V.
 Smith, Francis G.
 Smith, Sidney H., III
 Smith, Wallace D.
 Snyder, Charles R.
 Stalker, Donald J.
 Stipe, Robert B.
 Straw, Edward M.
 Sullivan, Edward F.
 Sullivan, Jeremiah M.
 Sullivan, Joseph M.
 Tait, Clifford W., Jr.
 Tapia, Phillip N.
 Taylor, Lynn C.
 Totten, Randolph B., II

Trampe, Theodore P.
 Trubi, Charles V., III
 Turner, David B.
 Varner, Robert N.
 Waller, Terry G.
 Wenz, Robert L.
 Wight, William H., Jr.
 Williams, Ronald B., Jr.
 Wilson, Jack
 Wingard, Bobby N.
 Wolf, Carl G.
 Wons, Michael J.
 Yurkovic, Leonard S.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be Lieutenant

Jan. R. Dazey

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Thomas E. Langmann
 Stephen D. Csintyan
 David J. Bain
 Roger D. Williams
 John A. MacDonald
 Cameron A. Hatfield

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Allen E. Roll-and to be lieutenant (junior grade), and ending Bly R. Elder to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 16, 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3: 16: *That ye may be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man.*

Almighty God, as we turn to Thee in prayer, wilt Thou draw us closer to Thyself and to each other, that spirit with spirit may meet and share the wonder of Thy love and truth.

Fill us with an awareness of Thy presence and may we trust ourselves humbly and heroically to the power and guidance of Thy spirit as we struggle to find a way out of these confused and agitated times.

Wilt Thou so inspire those who hold positions of spiritual and political leadership that they may know how to organize and fashion the intelligence of mankind and fill it with a more vivid sense of solidarity and a finer social feeling.

Show us how we may apply the principles of religion and morality to the facts of modern life and may the heart of humanity have a passion to cultivate the mind of Christ with His feeling of compassion and justice and good will toward all the members of the human family.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 28, 1964.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
 The Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1964.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1964: Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; Hon. JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York; and Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Wisconsin.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HON. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, 25TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and attainments of William McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I deeply appreciate the honor accorded to me by my Ohio colleagues in permitting me to speak for them in tribute to President McKinley. I particularly appreciate this opportunity because this is my first address to this, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

It is most appropriate that we recall the life and achievements of another assassinated President on the anniversary of his birth. William McKinley, the 25th President of the United States, was born in Niles, Ohio, on January 29, 1843. The details of his family life, his early education, his long service in the Civil War, his activities as a young lawyer and politician, as Governor of Ohio, as a Member of Congress, and his able and successful occupancy of the highest elective office in the Government of the United States are all of interest even after the passing of so many years. The interest we feel in his life, his career, and his death has been heightened by the recent tragedy which reenacted his own tragedy.

William McKinley was a gentle man and a gentleman in every sense of the word, possessed of a pleasing personality, a natural kindness and a very cordial handshake. His favorite flower, the red carnation, which was subsequently chosen as the official flower of Ohio, is worn today by all Members of the House in a fitting tribute to his great character and achievements. Though gentle in manner, President McKinley was a strong leader. His party dominated both the House and the Senate and he was on the most friendly terms with party leaders on both sides of the aisle. His dignity, tact, and persuasiveness together with his long experience in the House had given him a complete understanding of the party organization and at the same time he had a strong independent character. Senator Hoar declared that, with the possible exception of Jackson, no President had established such influ-

ence over the Members of the Senate as McKinley. Elihu Root stated:

He was a man of great power because he was absolutely indifferent to credit. His great desire was to get it done.

He cared nothing about the credit and he understood the art of administering with a minimum of interference. He had great support in the Congress which he directed by the power of affectionate esteem, not by fear. In 1876 he was elected a Member of the 45th Congress. In 1891 he was elected Governor of Ohio and reelected in 1893. He was nominated by Senator Foraker for the Presidency.

In his nominating speech, Senator Foraker said:

No other name so absolutely commands all hearts, that is because all American people who know him, believe in him and love him. They know he is an American of Americans and they know he is just and able and brave.

He was elected in 1896 at a time when there was a great depression in our land; factories were closed and thousands were idle. He encouraged Congress to pass effective laws to deal with the situation. This Congress did and soon the wheels of industry were set in motion, commerce was revived and the Nation entered upon a career of prosperity unsurpassed in its previous history.

McKinley served admirably in the Union Army. In action he showed himself indifferent to danger and calm in the face of death. His courage was observed by Lt. Col. Rutherford B. Hayes, later to become President, who promoted McKinley to commissary sergeant in charge of the brigade's supplies when the Army of the Potomac advanced to the Maryland campaign. At Antietam, McKinley drove a mule team into the very midst of battle, carrying hot food and coffee to the troops. Hayes was now in command of the regiment and recommended that McKinley be commissioned. As an officer, McKinley was closely associated with Hayes and served on his staff as a first lieutenant. Hayes described McKinley as one of the bravest and finest officers in the Army. After distinguished service on the staffs of several generals, he was mustered out in 1865 with a brevet commission as major, signed by President Lincoln, for gallant and meritorious service in the Shenandoah Valley.

His courage, demonstrated in battle, was demonstrated later in his political life and even at the end of his life. When he was shot in Buffalo by the assassin, Czolgosz, his first thought was for that very assassin and next for his wife. When the assassin was struck a blow in the face after the shooting, McKinley said, "Don't let them hurt him." If he had not uttered these words, the assassin might have met violent death then and there. McKinley then whispered, "My wife, be careful how you tell her—oh, be careful." He suffered for many days and as the end drew near he said to his doctors, "It is useless, gentlemen. I think we ought to have prayer." He asked for his wife and she came in. A small group of family members and

friends stood in the rear of the room. The President said in a very weak voice, "Goodby—goodby, all." "It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done." He began to whisper the words of a favorite hymn, "Nearer, my God to Thee, nearer to Thee." Those were his last words and in the early morning hours of September 14, 1901, he passed away leaving behind the memory of a great man who carried well the responsibility of the most powerful office in the world.

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

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

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has done a magnificent job today on the life and accomplishments of William McKinley. It is my great honor to represent the same congressional district in the House that William McKinley represented when he was here. I think history will prove that some of the great accomplishments of McKinley took place in this House of Representatives. His record here was outstanding. I think it was his record here that took him on to the Presidency.

I do not know whether it is generally known that William McKinley, after serving here for three terms, was defeated as a Member of the House. He then came back and served three more terms, and was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means when he was again defeated. Had he not suffered those defeats, perhaps he never would have been President of the United States. He might have stayed here as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as most anyone would. But because of the courage of his convictions he actually was defeated, and then his convictions were proven to be right. That was the thing that brought him the Presidency of the United States. The recent very sad events of November of last year, when another great President was assassinated and shot down, brought back to the memories of many of my constituents who are older, the sad days of the assassination of this great President, William McKinley. He, too, was beloved throughout the land, as was the late President, and the Nation mourned. As I say, these tragic events brought back these memories to the people of my area and I am sure throughout the Nation.

I appreciate very much the gentleman's remarks, and I may say on behalf of the people of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio that we appreciate the courtesy of the Speaker of the House and the officers on the majority side for permitting and participating in the proceedings to honor the memory of a great former Member of the House of Representatives, a great Governor of Ohio, and an outstanding President.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like very much as chairman of the Ohio delegation to join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] in presenting congratulations to our colleague, Mr. Rich, for a splendid address on our martyred President, Mr.

McKinley. All of us from Ohio, of course, are very, very proud of the contributions our State has made throughout the years to the Nation.

William McKinley was one of the great Presidents. He came from Ohio, and we Ohioans appreciate very deeply the thoughtfulness and the courtesy of the Speaker of the House, and of the House itself, in permitting us through one of our selected Members to have these few minutes each year on the 29th of January—the birthday of William McKinley—to pay honor to his memory for all the things he did to help make this the great Nation that it is today. I thank you again, Mr. Rich, very, very much.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished delegation from Ohio in this word of tribute to a great Ohioan, a great former President—a martyred President—and a great and distinguished former Member of this House.

Many Chief Executives have served in the House of Representatives, but I doubt that any of them had a career of public service in this body more distinguished than the career of the outstanding former President whose memory we honor today. He was one of the tall timbers in the history of our country. All Americans were saddened, as they were saddened only a couple of months ago, by the assassination of another great President, when he was shot down. All Americans respect the memory of William McKinley and are grateful for his contributions to our Nation's welfare.

Mr. RICH. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for the courtesy you have extended me.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the schedule for the balance of this week and next week.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio, upon completion of consideration of the resolutions which will be presented by the Committee on House Administration today, we will have finished all our business until Friday. It will be my purpose to ask that the House adjourn over until Friday in view of the fact that we will be in session Saturday both this week and, undoubtedly, next week.

Of course, it is well known that starting Friday, we will take up the rule and

thereafter the Civil Rights Act and continue with the consideration of that legislation until it is disposed of.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I add, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the House Committee on Rules will report a rule on the civil rights bill tomorrow and that the chairman of our distinguished committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has already obtained unanimous consent to have until midnight tomorrow night to file the rule so that the bill will be taken up on Friday.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his observation, which is correct. The gentleman of course is the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules and what he has said is worthy of the attention of the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much.

SUCCESSFUL LAUNCHING OF SATURN VEHICLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to stand here in the well of the House of Representatives this morning and tell you that today we launched the first Saturn vehicle. It has a load comparable to the payload that it will eventually carry. As of now it is in orbit with everything functioning as it is supposed to function. This successful launching gives us a booster with over 1½ million pounds' thrust.

This has been the result of long and arduous work. A booster such as the Saturn is a complicated piece of machinery. There is nothing with which to compare it.

The fact is that the several stages have separated correctly insures the efficiency of the vehicle. This huge rocket can orbit 19 tons. It is the rocket which will be used to do the preliminary work in the moonshot. Because it has gone off so well speaks well for NASA. I congratulate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the staff at Huntsville under Dr. von Braun, the staff and Dr. Debus at Cape Kennedy, and the contractors involved on a great and successful launch.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I believe it is worthwhile to take particular note of what the chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has had to say about the successful launching of this particular vehicle, because this Saturn vehicle gives us a rocket with more thrust than anything anybody else has, including the Soviet Union. We have now surpassed in power everything we know the Soviets have.

Mr. MILLER of California. To try to describe it to Members who may not quite realize how big this rocket is, it is 22 feet in diameter. Twenty-two feet is a distance which would be approximately from the floor on which I stand to above the top tier of seats in the gallery, if Members can imagine a circle that big. It has nine thrust chambers in it, so Members know approximately the size of the vehicle that has been launched.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It would not be amiss, would it, to give credit to the taxpayers of the country for having financed this accomplishment?

Mr. MILLER of California. My good friend knows that everything we do here—good or bad—we credit the taxpayers with doing, so I think his observation is hardly valid.

SOVIET OFFER ON BOMBERS MUST BE REJECTED

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers are carrying reports of a proposal just made at Geneva by the representative of the Soviet Union, calling for the destruction of all bombers with an alleged purpose to "reduce the danger of war and increase the security of all peoples."

The true and obvious purpose of this proposal is to increase the security of the Communist world at the expense of the security of the United States and its allies, for we now enjoy a substantial margin of superiority in the field of bombers.

Should the Soviet Union succeed in selling this deal, they would at one stroke nullify both the Strategic Air Command and the American carrier strike force—two of the major deterrents to Communist aggression in the world today.

In essence, the Russians offer to trade a mouse for two horses, and this must be obvious to all objective observers. The Soviet offer should be rejected immediately as a phony proposal unworthy of serious consideration. It is an invitation to unilateral disarmament which is a certain road to the destruction of freedom.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I believe the gentleman has made a significant commentary on this proposal by the Soviet Union, and one which certainly is worthy of our attention. I wish to associate myself with the position the gentleman has taken here. I can only add that merely

because the sun is shining in Moscow the cold war is not thawing here in the United States, and we still must maintain our guard.

BREAKING THE TREATY WITH THE SENECA INDIANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, among other Members of the House, I have been distressed beyond measure that the leadership of the House not too long ago saw fit to break the treaty made in 1794 with the Seneca Indians. This treaty gave them certain lands in perpetuity. They are being turned out of those lands 8 months from now without even having a place to go. I refer those interested to my insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, 1963.

This morning I listened to a broadcast on "Today" and saw the Indians gathering for the last time in the Long House for certain dances. I was glad we were not permitted entrance. It must have been a very sad time for them.

I listened also to a judge of their tribe who spoke with great restraint. I quote:

We who have lived in this area always, feel justified in remaining where we are until we do have homes to move into. The Pennsylvania Railroad, without any hearings or any arguments was given \$20 million to move its steel rails. We are not made of steel. We have souls and feelings imbedded deep in this ground, but we have not been considered and no provision has been made for us.

A very old woman sitting against the wall of a house said with tragic feeling, "A treaty—what is the use of treaties? This land was given us to be ours 'as long as the river runs and the sun shines'."

A very fine looking man described watching an anthill that had been stepped on. The ants were confused, some of them attempting to fight. "That is about the way we feel," he said.

A chief warned, "Be careful with your immigration laws. We were careless with ours."

To me, Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the Kinzua Dam is very great for the Seneca Indians, for whom so far we have done nothing but deprive them of the land we promised them in 1794. The greater tragedy is that the United States of America saw fit to permit the desire for power of a few men to instigate the breaking of our word and the loss of our honor. This, Mr. Speaker, is something we cannot live down. The least we can do is to get very busy, very fast, and see to it that these 140 families who built their homes and educated their children and owe no man a penny, shall have new homes in adequate time.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 209)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 13th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 1964.

INFORMATION PROGRAM ON PERILS OF TOBACCO USE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which will help point out to everyone, particularly younger folks, the hazards of smoking.

First of all, I would like to say that the bill will not outlaw the use of tobacco. Its use would still be an individual decision for each person.

This bill will give the Federal Trade Commission absolute authority to require cautionary labeling on cigarette containers.

This labeling would note that well-informed scientific opinion believes that smoking is hazardous to health.

The same cautionary statement would be required to be announced on radio and television commercials.

In addition, the FTC would be given authority to require that cancer-causing agents be listed on cigarette packages or agents thought to be cancer causing by sound scientific opinion.

The second part of the bill provides that the Surgeon General shall continuously compile lists of all Government publications relating to the effect of cigarette smoking on health.

This list would be sent periodically to all schools and colleges in the United States and its possessions.

From the list, each time it arrived, schools could select five of each of the publications, free of charge, for classroom use.

The Government does have a moral obligation to warn people and to initiate an information program because it subsidizes the tobacco industry and has helped it increase production.

I believe it is most important to point out to young people that cigarette smoking should not be taken up without considerable thought.

The recent Surgeon General's report on the subject emphasized that men who

began smoking before the age of 20 have substantially higher death rates than those who begin after 25.

This does not mean that it is safe to start after 25.

However, it shows the urgency of advising young folks about the perils and the necessity of establishing a sound and continuing information program.

If some of our young people profit by the great discussions going on about this subject, any efforts by those of us interested in their welfare will be worth while.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 31

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

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 587 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the additional expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 36 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$250,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, following line 13, insert:

"Sec. 2. The Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House."

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that to some extent the increase in appropriation to the Judiciary Committee will be used for additional minority employees?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 590 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 55, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, not to exceed \$100,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 3, strike out all of lines 3 through 10, and insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House."

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

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

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] will explain to the Members of the House that these amendments having been added to these two bills will be added to all other committee appropriation bills in the future and that appropriate steps are being taken to implement the same idea with reference to those committee appropriations previously made.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is the intent that with respect to all other bills, in the future they will have the same amendment.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AND STUDY, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 607 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 84, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, consultants, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out lines 1 through 8, and insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF COPIES OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY'S THANKSGIVING PROCLAMATION FOR 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 597 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed five thousand copies of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy's Thanksgiving Proclamation for 1963 as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the last official proclamation of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was his 1963 Thanksgiving proclamation. It was written by the President prior to his tragic assassination on November 22 which prevented him from reading this proclamation and sharing in one of our most important national holidays.

This proclamation is of very great historical value and I feel certain that many American citizens would like copies of it. I can testify to the fact that there is a large demand for this document in Massachusetts. Certainly the proclamation is of national importance and national value—there will undoubtedly be a national demand for copies of the proclamation.

The printing costs will be minimal. The "usual" cost of printing the first 1,500 copies is \$46.53 and the cost for each additional 1,000 copies will be only \$4.76. Consequently, the total cost to the House of Representatives will be just \$70.33.

In view of the importance of President Kennedy's Thanksgiving proclamation of 1963, I am glad the House approved my resolution, House Resolution 597.

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY DELIVERED AT THE CAPITOL ON JANUARY 20, 1961

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document the inaugural address of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy delivered at the Capitol, Washington, District of Columbia, on January 20, 1961. Such inaugural address shall be printed in a form appropriate for framing and office wall display, and in such colors and with such artwork as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed 322,500 additional copies, of which 103,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 219,500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE HALLS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 69 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document all remarks by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUROPEANS AND JAPANESE SHOULD JOIN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. STAFFORD. 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I will introduce a House concurrent resolution inviting rich European nations and Japan to participate in the Inter-American Bank. The objective of this resolution is twofold: First, to get our allies and friends to share the cost of maintaining freedom in Latin America. Secondly, to provide Latin America with a greater range of advice and assistance available from countries that have had considerable experience with developing areas of the world.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT CITED

This resolution is intended to carry out the stated intent of Congress as embodied in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. I am sure that my distinguished colleagues will recall changes made to the chapter I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by last year's foreign aid bill. Section 102 in the last paragraph was amended to read, and I quote:

Finally, the Congress urges that all other countries able to contribute join in a common undertaking to meet the goals stated in this part. In particular, the Congress urges that other industrialized free world coun-

tries increase their contributions and improve the forms and terms of their assistance so that the burden of the common undertaking, which is for the benefit of all, shall be equitably borne by all.

The resolution I will introduce on Friday reads as follows; I quote:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the purpose of the Inter-American Development Bank, to contribute to the acceleration of the process of economic development of the member countries, could be further implemented by permitting and encouraging participation in the activities of the Bank by additional industrialized free world countries, particularly the industrialized free world countries of Europe and Asia. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to formulate, propose, and seek the adoption of such amendments to the articles of agreement establishing the Bank as may be necessary to permit and encourage such participation.

Accordingly, the purpose of this resolution is to translate a general statement of policy into a concrete offer to share the burden equitably.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS RELIEF

There are impelling reasons for the Congress to give rapid consideration to this resolution. Our balance-of-payments problem continues and a deficit of some proportions appears to be built in rather than temporary. Some relief must be found for America's terrific burden in defending and strengthening the free world. Were the Europeans and Japanese to participate in developing Latin America, the strain on our resources would be relieved. Moreover, it would draw to the attention of foreign businessmen, the very real possibilities for expansion within the Latin American market.

AMERICA'S STRATEGIC COMMITMENTS

From a strategic standpoint, America finds itself committed at virtually every point of the compass. In some areas— notably the Republic of China, South Vietnam, the Caribbean, and Latin America—we are directly committed with little or no assistance from our affluent allies. That their present affluence is in part the result of the American taxpayers' efforts need not be dwelt upon at length, but should certainly be remembered by those who continue to exist under the umbrella of our strategic forces.

In other areas of the world, we are daily being asked to increase our share of the common effort to defend the free world. Today's Washington Post, for example, has a large headline indicating that the British have asked for American help in Cyprus. Britain has depleted its armed forces to the point where her commitments are outstripped by her resources. Once again, we are being asked to step into the breach. If we are to assume responsibilities in areas of the world where others should be playing the leading role, then the burden that should be equitably borne by all is going to be even less equitable. In short, it is time for our allies to match their

words with actions. What are America's allies doing?

WEST GERMAN TRADE WITH RUSSIA

West Germany has become the largest nonbloc trader with the Soviet Union. Germany is so opulent that there is a labor shortage. Shades of Appalachia. The West Germans cry "Foul" whenever it is suggested that America reduce the size of its armed forces defending West Germany. Each army division we keep in Germany costs us \$93 million a year in balance of payments. And yet, Germany is Russia's most important free world supplier of goods and services. Rich West Germany has time and again made statements about aid to developing countries. Very little has actually been done by them. My resolution would offer the Germans a concrete plan for sharing the burden.

FRANCE DABBLES IN CHINESE PUZZLE

France, under the grandiose leadership of President de Gaulle, has announced plans and policies for just about everything except Westchester County. In addition to dabbling in the Chinese puzzle, De Gaulle has stated that France will play a greater role in Latin America. France certainly has the dollars and gold to gain membership into the Inter-American Development Bank.

Japan, recovering from the devastating effects of a war which it started, now adopts a benign attitude toward problems in Asia. It is true that we forced a pacifist constitution down their throats; however, Japan is certainly in a position to render financial assistance to Latin America. Those nations who are able to pay must now show reciprocity for the protection we give them.

OUR RELUCTANT BRIDES

Mr. Speaker, my resolution is an attempt to coax some reluctant brides to the altar. It is an attempt to provide a concrete opportunity for our allies to match deeds with words. Most important of all, it is an attempt to provide greater help for our good Latin neighbors.

U.S. PROFESSED ANTI-COMMUNIST POLICY IS FALLING APART AT THE SEAMS—CUBA TO ZANZIBAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's Cuban-Latin American supposedly anti-Communist policy in this hemisphere, in my opinion, is falling apart at the seams and the efforts to economically isolate Cuba are alarmingly ineffective.

In recent incidents in just the past few days alone we have seen a deterioration of our so-called "containment of

Cuba policy" which vividly illustrates the unwillingness and inability of this administration to exert the necessary leadership to thwart the Castro-Communist menace in our own hemisphere.

Yesterday it was reported that Havana and Sweden signed a long-term trade agreement to provide machinery repair parts and raw material for Castro's concrete industry. I place in the RECORD an Associated Press report from Miami under date of January 28, which states, as follows:

Havana radio today announced a long-term trade agreement with industrialists in another non-Communist country, Sweden.

The statement said the Cuban Ministry of Construction signed an 8-year contract to provide machinery repair parts and raw material for Fidel Castro's concrete industry.

Yesterday, as well, Brazil's chief United Nations delegate, Ambassador Carlos Bernardes, called for a "new look at the Western Hemisphere's policy toward the Cuban Government of Fidel Castro."

What did he propose? Bernardes said that Cuba should never have been suspended from the OAS, that Cuba should be treated the same as Communist countries outside the hemisphere. Of course this brings to mind the wheat deal with Russia. Further, I might point out that Bernardes will be serving as President of the Security Council next month.

Let me read this article into the RECORD. It is an Associated Press dispatch dated January 28 from the United Nations, New York:

Brazil's chief U.N. delegate today called for a new look at the Western Hemisphere's policy toward the Cuban government of Fidel Castro.

Ambassador Carlos Bernardes told newsmen at a luncheon that Cuba should never have been suspended from the Organization of American States, but instead should be treated the same as Communist countries outside the hemisphere.

One way to help ease tension is to halt all anti-Castro actions for a period of time to permit emotions to cool, he asserted.

Bernardes, who will take a turn as President of the Security Council next month, also expressed hope that the United States would agree to negotiate a new treaty with Panama governing the control of the Panama Canal.

This is Brazil, the country to whom we extended just last year some \$800 million worth of additional credit, additional aid, through negotiations with the United States and Brazil, to which many of us objected. We find that country now turning its back upon the United States and its policy and following the Commie line demanding renegotiation of the Panama Canal treaty, contrary to the stated objectives of this administration and this country, and secondly, calling for easing of tensions by returning Cuba to the Organization of American States and in effect trading with it as we are doing with some other Communist countries, completely contrary to the announced policies of this country.

Just this morning it was reported that two Spanish shipbuilders arrived in Havana to discuss Cuban needs for fishing boats and other vessels. I quote this

article, a news dispatch recorded in this morning's Washington Post:

CUBA.—Two Spanish shipbuilders arrived in Havana to discuss Cuban needs for fishing boats and other vessels. The United States has been trying to persuade Spain not to build ships for the Castro regime.

Unsuccessfully—I add—did we try to persuade Spain despite the tremendous economic assistance that has gone from this country to Spain and the substantial military assistance as well in the past.

Thus, our policies with regard to economic embargo of Cuba are, as I said before, falling apart at the seams and our policy is alarmingly ineffective in our efforts to economically isolate Cuba.

Of course, this is to be added to the British bus deal which many, myself included, objected to, between the British and Cuba in recent days but the U.S. Government, showing a lack of real determination, did not offer any official protest to it.

One of the most abortive aspects of our so-called policy of containing Cuba is the State Department's removal—and now listen to this—the removal from the blacklist of the English ship, the *Tulsa Hill*, presently docked in Baltimore. This ship has been carrying on trade with Cuba and should not, in line with what has been stated as our trade ban policy, be allowed to dock in this country. Yet, it is here and it is here with the blessings of our State Department. And the National Labor Relations Board in addition to the State Department is putting every conceivable pressure on the maritime unions who are good Americans, who oppose Castro, and who refuse to load such ships.

Similar pressures are being exerted on the maritime union in New York where some 26 foreign-flag ships have been taken off the blacklist despite the fact they trade with Cuba, contrary to our announced trade ban. I add two UPI reports of January 21 and 22 at this point.

NEW YORK.—A State Department official met with Maritime Union leaders today in an effort to get ships removed from a union blacklist which has prevented them from loading grain.

G. Philip Delaney, special assistant to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, met with Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, and Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association.

The ships had been involved in trade with Cuba. One of them is the *Tulsa Hill*, a British-flag vessel due in Baltimore today to take aboard a cargo of grain. The ILA ordered its Baltimore local not to unload the ship.

NEW YORK.—Maritime Union leaders today kept 26 foreign-flag ships on a blacklist, preventing them from loading grain in the United States.

The ships were put on the blacklist because they traded with Cuba.

Union Leaders Paul Hall, Joseph Curran, and Thomas W. Gleason rejected a State Department request that a ban against longshoremen loading them be lifted.

Gleason said yesterday after a conference with G. Philip Delaney, special assistant to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, "that more

ships probably would be added to the blacklist."

The ships hoped to load some of the grain sold to Iron Curtain countries.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I heard only this morning something that is hard for me to believe: that the Navy at the Guantanamo base provided a ship pilot to take a Russian freighter through a nearby strait so that the Russian ship could dock and unload cargo at a port on the coast of Cuba. This is something that is hard to believe. Does the gentleman know anything about it?

Mr. CRAMER. No; I know only what the gentleman has stated. But I think it is a matter that certainly the Members of Congress should inquire about of the military in charge of Guantanamo as to what our policy is with relation to the military aspects in the Caribbean area as it relates to assistance to Russian ships and other ships going to Cuban ports or trading with Cuba. Because, and I am sure the gentleman agrees, obviously if this is being done as a matter of military policy, it is in direct violation of any meaningful economic embargo or isolation of Cuba. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest that is a matter I, for one, will take up with the Department of Defense to find out what the facts are because if we are, in fact, encouraging and assisting in this manner Russian ships or other ships trading with Cuba, then it is in complete contravention of what our announced trade policy is.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Can the gentleman tell us what has happened to the Monroe Doctrine? Apparently it has been thrown into the diplomatic ashcan.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, the Monroe Doctrine is apparently a dead letter so far as the administration is concerned. The previous Khrushchev-Kennedy doctrine and now apparently the Khrushchev-Johnson doctrine of coexistence with Communist Cuba so far as I can see has been substituted for it, which means at least at the present time that the existence of communism in this hemisphere which was supposed to be a violation, being an alien philosophy, of the basic Monroe Doctrine principle, is going to be permitted to continue—or that at least sufficient affirmative action through our leadership of the OAS or otherwise to get rid of that Communist menace is not the policy of this administration. The weak, concession-making policy of the administration has been shown not to be effective in accomplishing the objective loudly announced, but quietly undermined, of even imposing economic sanctions against Communist Cuba.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman mentioned the fact that some concern had been expressed by the U.S. Government regarding the sale of buses by England to Castro. The U.S. Government seems to be dismayed at this news. I cannot see why they should be so concerned when they have been so ready and willing to approve of and condone the sale of wheat to Russia and to other Communist countries, and in so doing, simply building up the economy of Communist nations that have promised to bury us. Furthermore, we furnish planes to Yugoslavia and we give aid to Poland, and we have been quite generous with other Communist countries.

I cannot quite see why the administration should object so much to the sale of buses to Castro, although personally I do not approve of it. Giving aid to the Communists is bad business in anybody's language.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman has placed his finger on the insecure contradictory moral position in which we have placed the United States in the eyes of nations throughout the world. Great Britain throws our wheat deal with the Communists right back in our face on their bus deal with Castro. Again I say that we offered no "official protest" to this bus deal. If we are willing, by congressional action giving permission, to trade wheat to Russia and Communist satellite nations even on credit, how can we be in a strong position morally in the eyes of other nations when the United States says that it is wrong for other nations to trade with a Communist country, meaning Cuba?

In other words, we want a dual double standard hemisphere policy. We want to be able to say that it is wrong for our allies to trade with Cuba, because that militarily equipped country is 90 miles from our shores, but it is not wrong for us to trade with Russia, even though that country may be 500 or 300 miles or even closer from the territory or shores of some of our allies in Europe and the Near East, for example.

That simply does not make good sense to them, and it certainly did not make good sense to me when the Congress voted on the amendment late last year giving the President the power to go ahead with the wheat deal even on credit.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. In all the negotiations and transactions with Communist nations which now seem to involve us all over the world—and, may I say largely to our detriment—does the gentleman agree with me when I say that whenever the United States of America stands firm

it wins and whenever the United States equivocates or accommodates or appeases, it loses? Does not history bear this out?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I have stated that time and time again. I believe it sincerely. The missile crisis proved this conclusively.

I have talked to the ambassadors and representatives of many Latin American countries. The general consensus seems to be that the Organization of American States—despite the fact that it is historically one of the most useful and skillful multination instruments in existence—is only as effective as is the U.S. leadership of it. Unless the United States gives firm leadership and unless we outline a program in specifics to get rid of Castro's communism and communism in general in this hemisphere that goal will not be achieved.

We did not take advantage of the opportunity offered by Venezuela, which demanded in recent days that a firm program be evolved regarding Castro's Communist subversive activity in that country and in the hemisphere.

So, even when another country in this hemisphere asks for leadership and partnership with the United States, if you please, in respect to getting rid of Castro's communism in Cuba and subversion throughout Latin America—and, yes, now spread to Zanzibar—we do not even help in partnership with other countries to strengthen the leadership of the OAS in accomplishing that. This was a golden opportunity—lost because of our indecision and vacillation.

I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman spoke previously about the *Tulsa Hill*, the ship being used to haul the grain to Russia. That particular ship is tied up in the Baltimore harbor, which is in my congressional district.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, the gentleman can speak with authority, I am sure.

Mr. GARMATZ. I might say that the owner of the ship has asked for a court order from the judge, seeking to compel the members of the Longshoremen's Union, the ILU in Baltimore, to load the ship. They have refused to do so. Their business representative, Mr. Hale, who represents the longshoremen in Baltimore, has said that if the court order should come from the court the men would refuse to load the ship regardless. They have made an agreement in Baltimore that they will not load grain or any other commodity on any ship on the black list, which has been hauling grain into Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is the position of the longshoremen in Baltimore. I

hope they maintain it. I am sure they will, even though the State Department is trying to get out from under. I admire the longshoremen for their attitude and the stand they have taken in this grain situation.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman and congratulate him on his support of the ILU's action. It is really a travesty that in order to carry out what is the announced policy of the State Department not to permit any ships that trade with Cuba to use U.S. ports—though even that policy is filled with many loopholes and does not go far enough so far as a real trade embargo is concerned—it takes action by red-blooded Americans to implement this policy and to prevent it from being scuttled. I take my hat off to those labor union members who themselves insist upon the United States carrying out its own announced policy of blacklisting Cuban-trading ships, especially when the U.S. Government, through the State Department and the National Labor Relations Board, tries to subvert the very policy our Government says it is trying to carry out. I congratulate every member of that union, and I congratulate the gentleman from Maryland for sustaining them in their forthright anti-Communist and pro-American position.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to compliment him for bringing this continued lack of policy before us here on McKinley's birthday, because it was during McKinley's administration that we first liberated Cuba. I think it is appropriate that we describe this as a lack of policy rather than a policy of containment or as an announced foreign policy of the United States or of the State Department's machinations concerning policy, whether it be foreign or in the Western Hemisphere or elsewhere. I mention that because as has been pointed out by the gentleman in the well of the House, the gentleman from Florida, who knows this situation so well, and by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], we can have no policy and insist on no rights in the world community when we do that very thing for which we criticize others. This applies to the question of the wheat sales for Russia versus the bus sales by one of our allies, and our lack of action in the Bay of Pigs, and the lack of containment, and the lack of insisting that our allies live up to the requirements for the blockade, and the lack of insistence on halting the export of subversion out of Cuba, whether it be to Venezuela or Panama or elsewhere. I think the gentleman is particularly to be commended for his statement about the Organization of American States begging for direction by their big brother in the Western Hemisphere and in keeping with the Monroe Doctrine. In view of what is happening around the world today in respect to our foreign policy, it is certainly time again that we

insisted on a definite, direct, moral foreign policy and that we insisted on the Monroe Doctrine and the various agreements that apply to the Western Hemisphere and, in fact, that we insist on speaking softly but carrying a big stick.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I am sure you noted that I referred to the "so-called" policy. He has been a real leader in this effort to get a firm anti-Communist policy in this hemisphere and throughout the world and, as I am sure the gentleman knows, the gentleman from Florida introduced a resolution last year intended fully to implement and restate the Monroe Doctrine, but the Congress has not seen fit to give any consideration to the resolution. The Congress, as a matter of fact, last Congress did turn down the Broomfield amendment offered by the Members on this side of the aisle and which I helped draft that would have written the Monroe Doctrine into the Cuban resolution.

Incidentally, even this watered down statement of policy by Congress has been largely ignored by the administration, as evidenced by its inaction even though:

First. Cuba's communism is being exported to other countries.

Second. Arms drops are taking place from Cuba to other nations.

Third. Subversive agents are still being trained in Cuba and returned to their homelands—even outside this hemisphere—vis-a-vis Zanzibar.

Fourth. Arms buildup in Cuba is still advancing at an alarming rate.

Fifth. Czech, Red Chinese, and Russian personnel remain in Cuba—as technicians or otherwise—in the thousands.

Sixth. The Communist menace, nurtured in and from Cuba, continues to challenge freedoms throughout the hemisphere.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if we have any assurance in the event wheat sales take place to the Soviet Union under credit that that wheat will not find its way eventually to Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. There is no assurance whatsoever, and I would not be a bit surprised but what the negotiations that took place between Castro and Khrushchev just the other day included some foodstuffs, whether in the same form that they are leaving the United States or in other forms, of flour or what have you, and that they will end up in Cuba. There is in my mind no question about it. If there were a question, what difference does it make whether it is U.S. wheat or byproducts thereof that is shipped to Cuba or wheat from Russia that will be used for this purpose because it can be supplemented as offset by our wheat? The result is the same. By making our wheat available to Russia they are able to sustain the food lack of Cuba, directly or indirectly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman will be interested in the fact that the Maritime Subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been holding hearings yesterday and today, and will hold more on this matter of grain shipments and the utilization of American-flag vessels or, rather, their lack of utilization. This matter came up this morning, and Mr. Giles, who is the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Administration, testified that the Administration policy is not to oppose the use of ships that have been violating President Kennedy's voluntary boycott against the carrying of goods to Cuba by utilizing these vessels and has no ban against private shippers utilizing these ships. On Government shipments under Public Law 480 grain cannot go in ships which have traded with Cuba. However, private transactions, such as it is claimed these recent sales are, are perfectly free to go on ships that have visited Cuba. The point is that the Maritime Administrator has said he has no authority to refuse to issue a permit for the utilization of these ships that have violated that ban. Under questioning, however, he had to admit it was just a matter of carrying out the President's policy. The President has the power and could stop this, but apparently the State Department feels that it makes for better relations with the Soviets. As I have often said, I disagree.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes additional.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman. He is a member of the committee investigating the matter and speaks authoritatively on it. I thank him for the important information that he has put in the RECORD through his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I think it clearly shows that the administration is using every available loophole to avoid putting into effect an announced limited shipping ban, even when the use of U.S. ports only by ships that have traded with Cuba is involved, to freeze out Castro economically. That is our announced, but subverted, trade ban policy. That is, we announce it publicly as our policy but we thwart it from behind the scenes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PELLY. It might interest the gentleman to know that the Maritime Administration has ruled American ships in and out of use. The Government decides when and where to use various types of American vessels. In other words, it is required that larger vessels

carry the wheat to the Soviet ports, whereas Public Law 480 shipments must go in smaller vessels that carry a higher rate.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. So the Administration has in effect, in order to accomplish the Russian wheat deal, found ways, loopholes, to accommodate this shipment, which completely violates in many instances Public Law 480, as one example, and there are other examples that the gentleman gave. They do that in order to accommodate shipping wheat to Cuba, completely violating and subverting the mandates of Congress and the rules and regulations emanating therefrom.

Mr. PELLY. As the gentleman knows, originally the public impression was that all this grain was going to go in American-flag vessels. We have 2,000 vessels available and could employ 20,000 seamen who need jobs.

Mr. CRAMER. That is right.

Mr. PELLY. Then there was an indication that about 50 percent of the grain would go in American bottoms. Now it looks as though it may well be that very little of it will be transported in American-flag vessels. Also it could well be that the rates and the subsidies that have been allowed on Durum wheat amounting to some 72 or 74 cents a bushel could be a windfall to a grain exporter, if he finds that he cannot use American-flag vessels, the larger ones which are assigned by the Maritime Administration to this task so the exporter will turn to foreign-flag vessels, perhaps some that actually have visited Cuba, and he will get the difference between the rates which could be a real windfall to him in the way of profits.

The truth is, of course, that under the Export Control Act full authority is granted to the President to issue permits and these can be limited to include only American-flag vessels or foreign-flag vessels that have not violated President Kennedy's voluntary boycott by engaging in trade with Cuba.

This inconsistency of supporting both sides in our cold war with the Communists demonstrates the U.S. policy of appeasement. Bit by bit, the policy of the United States is to appease the enemy. We have a policy of playing both sides in the cold war and in so doing, we are discriminating against our own merchant marine. This does not make sense.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman provides very valuable information. This further illustrates the extent the United States is willing to go to accommodate the Soviets in this wheat deal. I had understood, because I had checked with the State Department on this ship in Baltimore, for instance, and other ships, that they have lifted their ban on ships that trade with Cuba coming to U.S. ports for the purpose of carrying this wheat to Communist Russia and also when Cuban-trading ships do not carry Government-subsidized products to other countries. The latter is a further loophole dreamed up by the State Department to further limit the already limited trade ban. That does not make any sense and I congratulate the gentleman

on submitting this information for the RECORD.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable doubt throughout the country that Russia will ever pay for the wheat. They may pay for the first shipment or two, but that is just a foot in the door to build up a reputation whereby she will get additional credit. To those Americans who think that Russia is not going to pay us back, I will say that they ought to go to the news ticker over here and read the special item on the news ticker which indicates that the Russian jets have forced down another American plane and that three American fliers have been lost, just within the last 24 hours. To those Americans who think that Russia is not going to pay us back, let them take a look at that to see how they are going to pay us back.

I call upon the leaders of our Government to immediately cancel all shipments of wheat to the Soviet Union.

The unwarranted murder of three more American fliers by the Soviet Union should open the eyes of every red-blooded American. Over the years this is the 40th plane shot down by the Communists, costing our Nation almost two hundred American lives since 1947. The Communists know that they can callously shoot down any American plane they want and we are going to do nothing about it.

The tragedy of it is that the widows and children and parents of these American fliers, butchered in cold blood by the Communists, are going to have to pay 80 cents a bushel more for their wheat when they buy bread than the Russians are paying for the wheat they are getting from the United States.

I plead with the American people to rise in protest against this suicidal policy of the United States where we are feeding our enemy at the expense of the taxpayers of America so that they can butcher more American fliers as the days go by. Even more tragic is the fact that these American fliers that we send in flights in that area are not even given the protection of a firecracker that they can take along to defend themselves where the Soviet planes are loaded for bear, eating bushels of wheat given them by the United States.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman makes a very pertinent and very important point. What we are doing in this wheat trade with Russia is, we are increasing our concessions to Russia, on the basis that this will result in a cooling-off or "peaceful coexistence" situation with Russia. So we coexist and we make concessions and Russia kicks us in the teeth time and time again.

The Communists are on the march while we are deluded with their assertions of "peaceful coexistence."

Russia itself is responsible for the downing of one U.S. plane and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated, according to the news ticker, Russian jets

have forced down the unarmed American plane with three American fliers being lost. Russia itself, and with the help of Castro, has taken over Zanzibar, and caused uprisings in Tanganyika and encouraged uprisings in the Congo which have resulted in an American missionary's death. Promises of support to Sukarno in Indonesia by the Communists is evident. Cuban Communists' efforts were apparent in the recent uprisings in Panama.

In Cyprus there is threatened Greek-Turkish uprisings, undoubtedly being inflamed and encouraged by the Communists.

In Latin America, in addition to Panama and Cuba, further subversion and acts of violence in Venezuela occur. Chile is on the verge of possibly voting itself into communism, the Government of Brazil is tottering under pressures built up by communism, military coups in Honduras, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic were reputedly caused by efforts by the military to stave off Communist growth, which are just some examples of Communist activities in this hemisphere.

We are being hit from all sides and many of them simultaneously, knowingly, and purposely by the international Communist conspiracy while, at the same time, we continue to make concessions under the name of "peaceful coexistence."

I do not think there is any question but what Khrushchev is probing the Johnson administration to see how far he can go, believing that the administration will continue to be foolish enough to make concessions, even though they kick us in the teeth at the same time. The gentleman has pointed out the most recent example.

The degeneration of our entire policy, our refusal and our inability to contain Cuba, let alone take steps to get rid of that Communist fortress, is best evidenced recently by the export of Cuban subversion to Venezuela and Panama. It was reported in the press today that the Venezuelan Government has broken up another leftist Castro plot against President Betancourt's regime yesterday.

I quote the following UPI report:

The Venezuelan Government says it has broken up a leftist plot against President Romulo Betancourt's regime.

One of the seven persons arrested Monday night at a suburban Caracas mansion was Jesus Teodoro Molina Villegas, whom United Press International described as the suspected commander of the Castroite underground in Venezuela.

Molina Villegas led an abortive Marine revolt at Carupano in 1962 and later escaped from prison.

Two of the others arrested were leaders of the opposition Democratic Republican Union. Police said they captured arms and "abundant subversive material" in the raid.

In Panama, the following is reported in today's press:

PANAMA.—The far-left Panama Socialist Party called reports that Castro agents were behind the anti-American rioting this month "only part of the traditional policy of intrigue that American authorities put into play to disconcert and divide governments and people."

That is the poison being spread by the anti-U.S. politicians in Panama at this time throughout the world, and we have never offset it. This charge alone would be sufficient for the United States to offset the false charges of "aggression" by Panama by demanding a thorough investigation by the same peace committee of what unpeaceful subversive activities the Communists are involved in in Panama and the part the Communists played in stirring up the riots as anti-United States in design.

Today's UPI report on Panama's charge before the OAS that the United States is an aggressor—wholly false and maliciously designed to discredit the United States—best evidences the utter failure of the Johnson administration to offset this charge with affirmative counteraction—such as demanding an investigation into the Communist inflaming of the situations in Panama.

The UPI release follows:

WASHINGTON.—Panama informed an inter-American peace committee today that it intends to go before the Organization of American States and charge the United States with aggression.

Panama's declaration indicated the apparent collapse of efforts to mediate the dispute.

Miguel J. Moreno, Panama's Ambassador to the OAS and its chief negotiator, told the OAS peace commission that his country intends to carry before the OAS its aggression charge.

Sources said Moreno told the commission that further talks with the United States would be useless and that Panama sees no other recourse.

The peace group had interrupted the direct talks and called a cooling-off period today in hopes one side or the other would give in sufficiently to get the discussions off dead center. The commission, however, met this morning—apparently at Moreno's request.

The members of the peace commission urged Moreno at the closed-door meeting to try negotiations once again before going to the OAS Council, sources said, but there was no indication the plea had any effect.

Taking the charges before the OAS would put the touchy canal zone situation back in a state of crisis.

Panamanian President Roberto F. Chiari has said previously his country was ready to take the dispute before the United Nations if necessary.

Negotiations reached an impasse yesterday when Panama continued to insist that the United States give explicit assurances that it intends to negotiate a new Panama Canal treaty. The United States has insisted that it cannot and will not make such a commitment.

The situation heated up when long seething differences between the United States and Panama over the treaty under which this country operates the canal broke out in bloody rioting.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman agree that since Cuba stands as it does today as a center of guerrilla training for communism, a center for the export of sabotage and insurrection—

Mr. CRAMER. And weapons.

Mr. GROSS. In Central and South America the inflammation, the disease, will grow, and we will have more of these

situations on our hands to deal with. This cannot be stopped without removing the source of deadly infection, which is Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is exactly correct. From Cuba we find emanating the cancerous growth of communism. If we do not take the lead in finding a way to cut out the source of this cancer, then the Latin American nations of this hemisphere will fall one by one. There is no question that Chile may be the first country in the future to go Communist by the ballot box route, unless something is done to prevent it. You see what has happened in Venezuela. We know that in British Guiana under Jagan it could go Communist if England withdraws. We know what has happened in other countries. It is time we got along with plans to cut out the cancer. The gentleman is eminently correct.

There is one other report I want to comment on, and that is a UPI report relating to the Coast Guard patrol of Cuban fishing vessels. It is as follows:

A State Department official said today that Cuba will shortly complete construction of a fishing base making it easier for Russian vessels to operate along the American coasts.

William C. Herrington, Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife in the State Department, said that even without this port "foreign fishing vessels have been operating with increasing frequency off every State in the Union with a seacoast."

Herrington testified before the Senate Merchant Marine Subcommittee in support of a Coast Guard request for additional ships and planes to keep a constant check on Communist bloc fishermen.

He said that there is no evidence that the foreign trawlers operating off the U.S. coasts where anything "other than genuine fishermen legitimately proceeding in innocent passage * * *"

"However," he added, "any foreign vessel has the potentiality to collect intelligence, or to engage in operations which endanger the security of the United States."

Herrington said American fishermen have charged that at times they are harassed by larger Soviet vessels or by certain types of fishing operations.

He said in Alaska this involved Soviet trawling through American king fishing grounds where stationary gear is used; and off New England the propellers of U.S. vessels have been fouled by lost or discarded pieces of fishing net believed to be Russian.

Commandant Edwin J. Roland of the Coast Guard, in requesting a \$71.8 million authorization request, pointed out that many of the ships in service were obsolete, and many others were close to it and some were already useless.

Roland said the Coast Guard has 30 of the workhorse search and rescue vessels which are or will be overage by 1970. Of these, 18 are over 30 years old now and totally inadequate.

To fill in, the Coast Guard is using four small patrol boats which are unsuitable for extended searches and are needed elsewhere.

The Coast Guard is properly calling for our authorizing the spending of \$71.8 million for these ships and services to patrol Cuba's fishing vessels on the one hand while on the other hand one of our so-called allies, meaning Spain, is in Cuba for the express purpose of negotiating for the building of additional fishing boats and other vessels, and

Spain is a country, supposedly our ally, that we have lavishly supported with aid, both economic and military.

This is a further example of the ineffectiveness of our approach to world affairs—our lack of policy with which to combat the Communist menace can only lead to further Communist gains—further losses for the forces of freedom. The time is now to halt this rising, on-rushing Red tide—before, as Khrushchev said, it "buries us."

DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Davis-Bacon Act yesterday I urged the adoption of the previous question on the rule and defeat of the proposal to modify the rule. The pretense for defeating the rule was to permit adoption of an amendment to H.R. 6041 to provide a new system of judicial review.

As I pointed out at that time the proposed new system of judicial review is not practical and not workable. It would destroy the certainty in wage rates provided by the Davis-Bacon Act. It would create chaos in the Federal construction program by delaying vital construction projects. It would make a "gamble" of bidding that would inevitably result in increased Government costs. And it would be unwise to act rashly on the question of judicial review while the Labor Standards Subcommittee is now considering and holding hearings on this question and on related matters.

Judicial review is a very appealing concept. As a concept, it is a fine thing, and we are all for it. However, in this case, it is entirely misplaced.

We are considering here a program of wage determinations for Federal and federally assisted construction. This may be a hospital in your home district or it may be a missile site or a space project that is essential to our national defense. The construction work in these cases must be undertaken promptly. The wage determination is essential to this undertaking and must likewise be determined promptly.

What would the proposed judicial review do to this entire Federal construction program? Let me tell you.

Under H.R. 9590, the proposal of the gentleman from New York, Congressman GOODELL, any contractor or subcontractor, bidder, or prospective bidder, labor organization, employee or prospective employee and, so far as the bill is concerned, almost anyone who regards himself adversely affected by the Secretary's wage determinations can go into court and stop that project cold.

And what will the court do? It will consider, from the very beginning, what

wage determination is appropriate for this project. The court will disregard entirely what the Secretary did; re-examine all the evidence upon which the Secretary made his determination; and it may disregard any established practice, policy, or rule on which the Secretary acted.

The court then will determine the wage rate, and not the Secretary.

Not only that, but everybody knows that it may take months, and maybe years, to go through such court proceedings, especially in an area where the courts have no expertise and where they are called upon to make a wage determination that may involve hundreds of separate wage classifications.

Congress has never done this before, not even under the Walsh-Healey Act. It wisely recognized the complexity of such matters and has delegated the making of wage determinations to the administrative agency—the Department of Labor.

Of course, it would not end there. The decision of the district court may be appealed to the circuit court and then to the Supreme Court.

During all this time, what happens to the hospital in your home district, and to the missile site, or to the outer space project? Well, under the bill for judicial review, a contractor can take his chances. He can pay any wage he likes and post an indemnity bond sufficient to pay any difference that may—years later—finally be determined by the courts.

It stands to reason that a responsible contractor would find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to determine his costs and to bid intelligently on the proposed construction. It may be that some fly-by-night contractor would be willing to risk such a gamble, but costs to the Government would surely be increased, and consider what chaos the national construction program would face under such circumstances.

This would bring the law right back to the period before 1935, when there was no predetermination of wages on such construction. It would turn back the clock to a period of horrors for responsible contractors when they undertook contracts without certainty as to the wages they would be required to pay.

In 1935, these responsible contractors urged the Congress to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and Congress did, to provide for predetermination of wage rates. This proposed judicial review bill would again restore the uncertainty, and put labor costs, once again, in the jungle which is the industry.

I would not oppose judicial review if a proper and workable means could be devised. But, this proposal, I am persuaded, would greatly impair and impede vital Federal construction. It is not workable.

We all know that the Labor Standards Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is currently holding hearings and giving consideration to this matter. Other proposals for judicial and administrative review have been

presented for consideration by this subcommittee. All of them should be considered, with great care, in view of the tremendous harm that might ensue to the Federal construction program which is so vital, not only to national defense, but also to our entire national economy.

There is another reason why we should not act hastily on this matter of judicial review. The Secretary of Labor has just issued new regulations which provide for the establishment of a Wage Appeals Board. It will be composed of three public members selected on the basis of their qualifications and competence.

The Secretary has given to this Board jurisdiction to decide appeals on wage determinations, debarments, and other matters under the applicable statutes. The Board will have jurisdiction over all significant questions arising under these labor standards statutes which are within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. The Board is as independent as it can be made by the Secretary. Its decisions are final and are in no way subject to review by anybody in the Department of Labor.

The Secretary established this Appeals Board after consideration had been given to this matter by the Special Labor Subcommittee which held extensive hearings on the administration of the Davis-Bacon and related acts. He also considered the suggestions of 32 Federal and State procurement agencies, and others, including contractors' associations and unions.

I do not say that this Appeals Board will answer all the questions or take care of all the concerns or will be the best solution. However, we have a responsibility to give the agency which has been administering this program for over 30 years the opportunity to test the procedures which it recommends to solve this matter.

This does not mean that we will not be watchful or that we will not take action on this issue. As I pointed out, the Labor Standards Subcommittee is presently holding hearings on this very issue. We should have the benefit of its deliberation, in an orderly manner, before we act.

We would have been acting with flagrant disregard for the entire Federal construction program, the Federal wage standards program, and in disregard of the welfare of the entire country, if we acted impulsively here yesterday.

SAVE OUR SEAWAY—LEGISLATION TO GIVE THE GREAT LAKES WATERWAY RELIEF FROM ITS PRESENT BACKBREAKING FINANCIAL BURDEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we are in danger of losing our investment in the

St. Lawrence Seaway by attempting to extract financial returns from it too quickly. The Seaway Act of 1954 now contains an utterly unreasonable financial formula of payments to the U.S. Treasury which places upward pressures on seaway tolls at a time when the seaway is struggling to build up traffic. Only if tolls are kept low during the developmental period can seaway traffic grow.

This rational course is made difficult by the stringent capital payoff and high interest rate provisions written into the 1954 Seaway Act. If tolls are raised by the seaway to meet financial charges, its traffic will fall. We will lose our investment as well as the increased trade for which the investment was made in the first place. We shall then have killed the goose that could have laid the golden egg. The seaway would have been killed under the delusion that we can get rich quick from what should be recognized as a long-term investment, the returns from which will grow with the years. What we surely ought to do above all is to save our seaway and assure ourselves its manifold benefits for the Nation. To do so we should first look honestly at financial demands we have, in large part unwittingly, placed upon it.

PRESENT LAW REQUIRES A PARADOX: LOW TOLLS AND HIGH REPAYMENT CHARGES

In approving the St. Lawrence Seaway Act in 1954, Congress clearly did not intend it to be established, only to be strangled by high toll rates preventing the growth of traffic. In fact, the first of five criteria for setting tolls, set forth in section 12(b) of the act, emphasizes the need to encourage increased use of the seaway and the need to set especially low rates for bulk commodities. Section 12(b) (1) says:

The rates shall be fair and equitable and shall give due consideration to encouragement of increased utilization of the navigation facilities, and to the special character of bulk agricultural, mineral, and other raw materials.

Yet the act also requires in paragraphs (4) and (5) of the same section that tolls be set high enough to cover not only operating and maintenance costs and other current costs, but interest on the seaway's capital investment, plus interest on any interest deferred after June 30, 1960, plus funds for the amortization of the entire capital cost within 50 years of the opening of the seaway.

In order to comply with these two provisions, the seaway would have to pay into the Treasury over a 50-year period the entire capitalized construction cost, now estimated to be about \$131 million, but which may go up to the full \$140 million permitted under the act. In addition, interest charged at an annual rate close to 3½ percent means additional payment of about another \$160 million over the 50-year period. Thus the seaway must pay an annual average of at least \$6 million to cover interest and amortization, after paying all operating and maintenance costs.

Why were these high financial charges thought to be compatible with a reasonable schedule of tolls?

At the time the Seaway Act was under discussion, it was taken for granted that nothing would obstruct a rapid buildup of seaway traffic, starting at a high level of 25 million tons in 1959, rising to 37 million tons in 1963, and reaching a maximum of about 50 million tons in 1968. Under these traffic assumptions, only 4 years of operations were allowed as years during which traffic volume would be insufficient to meet current interest payments or to start paying off on capital. In these 4 years, it was thought that deferred interest might come to about \$4 million. In the fifth year, 1963, it was anticipated that the seaway could cover current interest charges and have a bit left over to start amortizing capital and deferred charges. By 1968, as the seaway achieved its 50 million-ton capacity, it was to have started a 41-year period of regular payments of \$6,078,000 per year.

ASSUMPTIONS OF PRESENT LAW NOT BORNE OUT BY ACTUAL SEAWAY OPERATIONS

In fact, seaway traffic did not attain the expected earlier volumes. Traffic in the opening year of 1959 came to 20 million tons, and it rose to 31 million tons in the fifth shipping season completed in December 1963. This achievement is astonishing in view of the fact that essential navigation complements to the seaway, the Great Lakes connecting channels and ports, were not ready in 1959, are not now ready, and will, in some cases not be ready for 5 to 10 years, to receive oceangoing vessels loaded to full seaway draft.

In 1959, only the seaway proper from Montreal to Lake Ontario was at the seaway depth of 27 feet. Connecting channels on the Great Lakes were not at this depth, and they constituted bottlenecks until dredging was completed late in 1963. Even at the present time, not a single Great Lakes port has both harbor depth and harbor channel approaches of seaway depth. For example, Milwaukee, a major port on the Great Lakes, now has harbor depths of only 21 to 25 feet. Channel approaches to the harbor are also not at seaway depth. Milwaukee Port Director Harry C. Brockel states that it will take 4 to 5 years to plan the engineering and to finish the actual job of deepening both channel approaches and harbor at Milwaukee to full seaway depth.

Apart from not being deep enough, the Great Lakes ports did not have and, in many instances, still do not have adequate harbor facilities: berthing space, cargo handling facilities, good dockside connections to rail and trucking lines, as well as needed ready access to banking and insurance facilities, freight forwarding services, and numerous related features which go together to make ports efficient in serving ocean traffic. Chicago has now invested more than \$100 million in new port facilities and plans to invest more. Milwaukee has invested \$14 million in a port expansion and improvement program. Toledo has spent a similar sum in harbor facilities. Other Great Lakes ports such as Duluth, Cleveland, Buffalo, Detroit, Hamilton, Toronto, and Rochester are investing additional millions to make up for harbor

deficiencies. It goes without saying that they cannot be made up quickly. But only when ships can load to the limit of seaway draft, dock at the main Great Lakes harbors, and receive prompt and adequate harbor services as well as get through the seaway's locks, can the seaway be considered a finished system.

An important economic factor has also affected seaway traffic during the past 5 years. Iron ore shipments from Labrador, which were expected to constitute a large part of the seaway's bulk cargo, suffered from a strike-recession-slow recovery cycle which hit the U.S. steel industry. In 1959, steel plants were shut down for a months-long strike and ore consumption was reduced; in 1960, the recession cut steel output and ore consumption; in 1961 and 1962, sluggish steel output again held down ore needs; not until 1963 was the rise in steel production substantial. Provided that the economy in general continues to move up vigorously, there is reason to believe that Labrador ore will, in the future, add substantially to seaway tonnage. Particularly is this so since the most modern steelmaking processes use more ore and less scrap per ton of finished steel, and two of the most modern new integrated steel plants are now going up in the Great Lakes area.

As a result of lower than hoped for traffic volume in the first 5 years of operation, the seaway's revenues for the 5 years totaled less than \$18 million instead of the anticipated \$25 million. Instead of deferring only \$4 million in interest charges in the 4 years, 1959-62, the seaway had to defer \$7,600,000. In 1963, instead of being able to meet current interest cost and pay back a little on capital and deferred charges, the seaway had to defer payment on an additional \$2,100,000 in interest due.

COMPETING TRANSPORTATION INTERESTS ARE DEMANDING THAT THE SEAWAY INCREASE ITS TOLLS

In the light of the physical difficulties which have been mainly responsible for holding down seaway traffic volume and revenues below desirable levels, the practical, businesslike approach would require the removal, as rapidly as possible, of physical obstacles, a lessening, if possible, of the financial burden, and an all-out effort to attract more traffic. The only course clearly ruled out in the face of low traffic volume is an increase in the toll rates. Yet this is the demand of certain transportation groups. Their economic sense as well as their objectivity appears open to question.

Under the terms of a 1959 agreement with Canada, tolls which have been in effect from the opening of the seaway through the fifth shipping season in 1963 are now being reviewed by toll committees appointed by both Canada and the United States. A decision on tolls for the future must be made by July 1, 1964.

The present toll schedule sets a rate of 40 cents per ton for bulk cargo and 90 cents per ton for general cargo, plus 4 cents per gross registered ton of the vessel. Additional tolls were originally charged for transit of the Canadian-owned Welland Canal connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. These were 2 cents per ton on bulk cargo, 5 cents per

ton on general cargo, and 2 cents per ton on the vessel. These tolls were suspended by Canada in July 1962, to increase traffic flow. For the same reason, at the beginning of the 1963 shipping season, in-transit cargo, both inbound and outbound, was exempted from all tolls.

Some of the most vigorous supporters for increases in these tolls are the North Atlantic Ports Association; the New York-New Jersey Committee for a Self-Supporting Seaway; the National Committee for a Nonsubsidized Seaway; and the American Association of Railroads. Their main arguments in favor of raising tolls are, first, that traffic on the seaway is not going to grow, so tolls must be raised to increase revenues so as to meet the financial requirements of the Seaway Act; second, that seaway traffic is "captive" traffic with nowhere else to go so that higher rates will not cut traffic volume; and, third, that failure to charge rates high enough to meet financial costs at present traffic levels constitutes an unwarranted Federal subsidy.

SEAWAY TRAFFIC: RECORD AND POTENTIAL

Nothing in the seaway record of the first 5 years indicates that it has stopped growing or that it will fail to reach its planned potential of 50 million tons in annual traffic. It is true that the seaway failed to achieve its target for 25 million tons the first year, and to achieve a total of 37 million tons in 1963. However, starting from the lower base figure of 20 million tons in 1959, seaway traffic grew to 31 million tons in 1963 at an average rate of 8.5 percent per year, exactly the rate of increase of the earlier forecasts. The growth has not been steady, but it augurs well for the future that 1963 showed a spectacular 20 percent rise in traffic over 1962.

Earlier estimates assumed that the seaway would grow at a little over 6 percent per year from a 1963 traffic of 37 million tons until it reached a maximum 50 million tons in 1968. In view of the seaway's 8½-percent growth rate of the first 5 years, there is no reason to think that it cannot continue growth at a 6-percent annual rate, until a 50 million-ton target is reached. However, since the achieved traffic figure for 1963 is 31 million tons and not 37 million tons, the target of 50 million tons should be reached in the early 1970's instead of in 1968.

On December 10, 1963, in testimony before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Great Lakes Transportation, U.S. Seaway Administrator Joseph H. McCann stated his opinion that the seaway could look forward not only to the 50-million-ton goal, but eventually to 60 million tons principally because of the continuing trend toward larger ships among users of the seaway, and because the present shipping season can be lengthened. Both these factors permit a higher volume of traffic to be realized without an increase of present seaway installations.

IF TOLLS ARE RAISED, ESTABLISHED TRAFFIC WILL FALL, AND NEW TRAFFIC WILL BE HARD TO GET

The claim that seaway traffic is "captive" traffic and that, therefore, tolls can be raised with impunity, is unfounded.

There is hardly an example of seaway cargo movement which could not be and is not moved by alternative methods of transport. Where traffic moves on the seaway now, it does so because at present toll rates, the seaway is more economical and shippers have found out about it—not because there is no other way to get cargo out to domestic or international markets. There is a huge complex of rail, barge, and pipeline systems serving most important midwest centers. If cost were not a consideration, the seaway in fact would not be needed.

Grain and other agricultural commodities west of the Mississippi can be shipped by a combination of rail and barge lines to gulf ports. Industrial goods can go by rail from the Great Lakes industrial area to seaboard consumers or to Atlantic and gulf ports for transshipment overseas. Labrador ores can proceed from the gulf of St. Lawrence by ship to eastern steel producing centers rather than to midwestern plants owned by the same companies. Petroleum products can be brought to major Great Lakes consuming areas by rail, by inland barge systems or by pipeline.

Under these circumstances, an increase in seaway tolls would be certain to reduce traffic. This would be particularly true in the case of agricultural commodities, which accounted in 1962—the latest year for which detailed figures are available—for nearly half of the seaway's tonnage. U.S.-origin agricultural traffic through the seaway, about 95 percent of which is grain, doubled in volume between 1959 and 1962, from 3,168,000 to 6,116,000 tons. The location of Great Lakes ports close to the main grain-producing areas makes it very advantageous to ship grain from these ports directly to oversea markets via the seaway.

Before the seaway was opened, export grain from the Missouri River area moved by rail or barge down to gulf ports. From the Northern States, it typically moved by rail to Duluth, then by lake vessels to Buffalo or Oswego for transshipment by rail to Atlantic ports. From the Central States, export grains often moved directly to Atlantic ports. These alternatives still exist and would be used if seaway passage became too expensive.

The strongest evidence that increased tolls would cut essential agricultural traffic for the seaway is to be found in the numerous rate reductions which have been made or attempted by railroad and bargelines since the opening of the seaway.

In the late summer of 1960, three midwestern rail lines reduced rates on grain moving from the Midwest to the gulf. Early in 1961, several western rail lines reduced rates on wheat moving from the Great Plains to the gulf. Mississippi bargelines have made a number of rate adjustments on north-south traffic and have attempted to establish joint rates with the railroads. In 1963, midwestern railroads connecting with bargelines going down to the gulf proposed a 10½-percent-per-hundredweight cut in rates applying to wheat, wheat flour, and certain other products. This rail rate reduction which would have eliminated any flour

SEAWAY FINANCIAL BURDEN GROSSLY
INEQUITABLE

shipments from lake ports, was fortunately suspended by the ICC on charges that the reduced rates would not cover out-of-pocket costs.

An August 1963 study of the St. Lawrence Seaway by the Department of Agriculture concludes that agricultural traffic on the seaway could increase from the present 12 million tons, about half of which is U.S. traffic, to a total of 22 million tons by 1968. However, the Department warns that higher toll charges would lessen the seaway's cost advantages so that competing rail- and barge-lines would make inroads on traffic which would otherwise move by the seaway.

In addition to increasing agricultural traffic as a mainstay, the seaway must try to increase industrial cargo, on which a more lucrative rate is earned. If toll rates are now raised, the first experimental uses of the seaway by a variety of shippers, demonstrating that important cost savings can be made, will have been for naught. Since experience and established ways of handling count for a good deal in shipping expensive merchandise, it is not surprising that only recently have shippers come to appreciate the seaway's advantages and savings.

Not until 1962 did the Department of Defense undertake a serious study of comparative shipping costs between the seaway and alternative routes where both are feasible. It concluded that the Government could have saved \$840,000 per year by using the seaway on defense shipments instead of alternative methods in fact used.

An automobile company recently managed to get a foothold in the Australian market through seaway savings in transportation cost reflected in the delivered cost of its cars.

The Milwaukee Harbor Board of Commissioners reports that shippers of quarter-inch hardwood, papermaking machinery, bottling machinery, packaged lard, and powdered milk found in 1962 that by using the port of Milwaukee and the seaway to export destinations, they saved from \$11.76 to \$26.38 per ton. Allis-Chalmers of Milwaukee saved \$25,000 by shipping a complete cement hill for delivery to Spain through the seaway.

Chrysler Corp. found that it saved \$195,000 on 13,000 automobiles shipped in 1962 to 40 foreign countries. In the same year, General Motors found that it had saved \$5,000 each on exports of 39 diesel locomotives.

If, even before word can get around that the seaway provides a possible method of shipment for general cargo, toll rates are raised, interest by industrial shippers will inevitably decline.

Far from raising rates, the only practical course of action may be to reduce rates. This may be not only desirable but necessary. It is possible that the Welland Canal tolls, suspended in July 1962, may be reimposed by Canada. Should this happen, tolls on the seaway proper would have to be reduced correspondingly even to maintain the present rate structure.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway is virtually the only transportation system which is by law required not only to cover its own operating and maintenance costs but also to pay interest at the going rate and to amortize the capital investment over a relatively short period. How onerous and inequitable this burden is can be judged by looking at the transportation subsidies which have been or are right now being given to other parts of our transportation system.

First. Ocean ship channels: The seaway is very like the ocean ship channels in that it serves a particular geographic area. Yet the ocean ship channels have not even had to pay operating and maintenance costs, to say nothing of interest and capital investment costs. For example, through the fiscal year 1964, the Federal Government has paid on behalf of the Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to the sea, \$49,492,420 in construction cost and \$108,754,924 in operating and maintenance costs; the Houston Ship Channel, \$59,562,000 in construction cost and \$30,149,501 in operating and maintenance costs; the Sacramento Deep Water Channel, \$40,158,192 in construction cost and \$9,520,966 in operating and maintenance costs—to June 1962; and the Mobile, Ala., Channel, \$13,038,017 for construction and \$15,605,976 for operating and maintenance costs.

Second. The Panama Canal: This famous waterway, about which dispute has flared recently between Panama and this country, is wholly owned and operated by the Federal Government. Toll rates are still about what they were 50 years ago. American intercoastal shipping, U.S. exporters to Japan of coal, grain, and steel scrap, and U.S. importers of mineral ores from Peru and Chile have been major beneficiaries of these low rates. However, unlike the seaway, the Panama Canal's benefits are increasingly going to other countries, including Cuba, whose sugar moves through the canal to Red China and the Soviet Union.

Although the Panama Canal was supposed to be a self-liquidating enterprise, we have received back only \$1 billion of the \$1.7 billion of the capital invested since 1903. Moreover, \$1,500,000 of the \$1,930,000 paid annually to Panama as Panama's share of the revenues is annually appropriated by the Congress and does not come out of canal revenues.

Third. The railroads: In the period from 1850 to 1871 the Nation's railroad companies received Government land grants of about 183 million acres. According to a Joint Economic Committee study, the value of this aid given to railroads came to nearly \$1.3 billion. The arrangement was that this subsidy would be paid off over time by giving the Government special low shipping rates. This form of "payment," still being made to the Federal Government, can in no way be considered analogous to the seaway's interest burden and requirement to retire capital invested. There is no way

to measure its adequacy in terms of a return on Federal investment or in liquidation of the investment itself.

It is also appropriate to note that while the railroads demand that seaway tolls cover all costs, including financial costs, they are themselves permitted by the ICC to reduce rates on commercial traffic to meet competition down to a theoretical out-of-pocket cost minimum.

Fourth. The airlines: The Nation's commercial airlines are beneficiaries to the extent of at least \$250 million of the \$750 to \$800 million appropriated each year to build airports, maintain and operate airways, provide navigation and landing aids, communications facilities, and weather advisory services. For all of this, commercial prop transport planes pay only a 2-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline, and jets, which do not use gasoline, pay nothing. Air passengers pay a 5-percent excise tax on their tickets, but no toll or charge is assessed on air freight.

When these indirect subsidies to the airlines do not suffice, the Civil Aeronautics Board stands ready to pay operating subsidies. These have been running at around \$80 to \$85 million per year.

Fifth. The merchant marine: U.S. shipping lines receive about \$330 million per year from appropriated Federal funds as subsidies, about one-third for construction and two-thirds to make up deficiencies in operating revenues. They enjoy a federally guaranteed monopoly on U.S. coastwise shipping, on all defense cargo, all exports purchased under Government loans, and half of all other Government cargo.

Sixth. Inland waterways: A statutory prohibition against ever charging tolls on our inland waterways which has its origin in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 was specifically reaffirmed in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1909. This act is still in force. Without arguing the merits of the matter, it must be recognized that the bargelines operating on the Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers have an immense cost advantage over competing modes of transport. Their cargo is toll free despite the fact that over \$2 billion of Federal funds have been invested in waterway capital improvements in addition to some \$70 million annually appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the inland waterways. Thus, railroad lines in cooperation with bargelines have time and again been able to quote lower rates and thus to divert traffic which might otherwise have been shipped via the Seaway.

Seventh. Trucking lines: While trucking lines, like other users of federally financed toll highways and bridges, presumably pay for their share of these new facilities, they are free to use all other highways, streets, and bridges in their business operations. It seems highly debatable whether their present payments in license fees, gasoline taxes, and other taxes would adequately cover their share of the interest and capital cost of past public investment as well as current operating and maintenance costs.

Outside the field of transportation, the Federal Government has been equally generous in projects where a long developmental period is required. For example, the TVA power facilities were permitted to go along for 27 years, from 1933 to 1961, without a definite program for interest payments and for repayment of capital. In this period, TVA power operations got well enough established not only to plow back substantial net operating revenues but to be able to issue their own bonds in the private capital market for expansion purposes. In another area, the Government makes loans to irrigation districts on which it charges no interest and sets 100-year terms.

The seaway, far from being subsidized, is practically the only major national development project in which the Government has thus far failed to see the need for long-term, if not permanent, investment. The attempt to make an exception of the seaway is not only shortsighted economics. It is also in serious conflict with principles which should govern Federal policy on major new transportation resources.

PRINCIPLES WHICH SHOULD GOVERN FEDERAL POLICY ON SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway ought to be governed by three financial principles, as opposed to those which now govern:

First. Investment cost: Since the seaway together with the Great Lakes can eventually be quite literally a fourth seacoast of the United States, the Federal Government should retain ownership of the U.S. share of the seaway in perpetuity. The Government should not try to amortize the cost of its investment over any fixed period—it should, instead, seek to be paid returns which will in time pay for the investment many times over. The form which the Government's investment should take is capital stock, not revenue bonds with a fixed term as at present. An example of a wholly owned Federal agency in which the Government's investment is held in the form of capital stock is the Export-Import Bank. The Bank's capital stock has a value of \$100 million.

Second. Return on investment: It seems reasonable that private users who benefit from the canal should pay, as part of their tolls, a return on the investment of the Federal Government. This should be, as at present, equal to the weighted average cost of actual borrowing by the Federal Government in the open market at the times that capital funds were actually invested in the seaway. But these returns to the Government should cumulate much as dividends on preferred stock rather than as interest on bonds. Such dividends should be allowed to cumulate and be paid by the seaway when earnings permit. No interest charges should be charged on deferred dividends.

Dividends payable for the indefinite future, rather than interest cost which ceases when capital is amortized, seems a fairer basis for setting seaway tolls so far as competitive modes of transport are concerned. The latter could result in an abrupt decline in tolls as financial costs

were eliminated, a decline which could not be met by seaway competition.

Third. Cost basis for setting tolls: In general, a cost basis for setting seaway tolls appears the most acceptable. However, in view of the fact that other forms of transportation regulated by the Government are permitted to meet competitive rates where such rates are not below out-of-pocket operating costs, far greater latitude to reduce rates than is at present possible should be permitted, particularly in the present developmental period. Moreover, tolls should be fixed at a level where they will cover return on the Government's investment as well as current operating and maintenance costs at full capacity operations. It makes no more sense to set seaway tolls at traffic levels achieved in the initial development period than it would be to set Federal bridge or road tolls on the basis of the first few vehicles which happen to pass through toll points.

The principle of setting user charges at full capacity operations rather than in the early years of a project when traffic is so slight that enormous tolls could be necessary to yield sufficient revenues, received strong support by an Eisenhower administration study conducted by the Commerce Department in 1959. The study states:

Recovery of Federal expenditures through user charges might be below full cost in the interests of the economic objectives of the program. Examples might be charges during the early years of a project before traffic develops, or charges based on full capacity use rather than on existing traffic in projects with very large capacities and traffic potentials. Such policies are not incompatible with a cost recovery doctrine. Where a low charge promotes a large use, total income over the longrun period may more successfully achieve the cost recovery goal than a high initial charge with low traffic. (U.S. Department of Commerce, User Charges on Inland Waterways, January 1959, p. 41.)

Like setting income-tax rates to balance the Nation's budget at full employment levels, seaway tolls should balance seaway costs at full-capacity operations. Just as an excessively high tax rate level prevents the economy from going on to full employment, attempts to recover more by high seaway tolls at a low-level traffic will only result in failure to reach capacity operations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEAWAY ACT

Accordingly, in order that seaway financing and seaway tolls can be in full accord with the principles I have cited, I propose certain changes in the Seaway Act. H.R. 9796, which I have introduced today, embodies these changes. They will better reflect the Government's true interest in having a conservative form of capitalization, a surer method of insuring a return on its investment, and lower toll charges if needed to stimulate traffic naturally suited to use the seaway. The changes follow:

First. Consider all revenue bonds outstanding and accrued interest charges as original investment, to be converted to an equivalent dollar amount of capital stock.

Second. Require an annual dividend of 3.42 percent—the present weighted average cost to the Government of capital invested in the seaway—on the capital stock, payable from the date of issuance of the stock, cumulative if not paid in any year.

Third. Require that tolls be set which will, at full capacity operations, recover all current operating and maintenance costs—save depreciation—and the 3.42 percent annual dividend on capital stock. The present tolls are to constitute the maximum permissible rates. Maintenance is to be considered sufficient to preserve the asset value of the seaway without any additional depreciation charges.

The text of the proposed amendments to the St. Lawrence Seaway Act of 1954, follows:

H.R. 9796

An Act to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5 of the Act of May 13, 1954 (Public Law 358, Eighty-third Congress; 33 U.S.C. 985), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 5."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In order to protect the investment of the United States in the Corporation's assets, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Corporation are authorized and directed to convert the revenue bond obligations referred to in subsection (a) hereof to capital stock in an amount equivalent to the outstanding principal amount of said revenue bonds and accrued interest. The Corporation shall pay a cumulative dividend on such capital stock of 3.42 percent per annum."

Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph (4) of section 12(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 988(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) That the rates prescribed shall not exceed those in effect on January 1, 1964, and shall be calculated to cover, as nearly as practicable, at full capacity operations, all costs of operating and maintaining the works under the administration of the Corporation, payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, payment of 3.42 percent per annum cumulative dividend on the capital stock of the Corporation, and payments in lieu of taxes."

(b) Paragraph (5) of such section (33 U.S.C. 988(b)(5)) is repealed.

WHAT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WILL MEAN FOR SEAWAY

These amendments will permit the seaway administrators to pursue economically sound toll rate policies and maximize financial return to the Federal Government.

On toll rates, the seaway could follow policies recently recommended by the Great Lakes Commission, an interstate compact of eight States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. The Commission recommends that present seaway tolls be considered a maximum and that a further period, until port capacity catches up to seaway channel capacity, be allowed the seaway for the

development of traffic potential. Provided that toll rates are sufficiently high to pay required costs at full capacity operations, my amendment would permit tolls lower than those now in effect if needed to develop the true economic potential of the seaway.

There would be no element of giveaway or subsidy under my amendments, but the financial burden on the seaway would be considerably eased.

At the present time, the seaway owes construction cost and capitalized construction-period interest totaling about \$131 million. In addition, there are a total of about \$10 million in interest charges deferred since the beginning of seaway operations. Conversion of these amounts in accordance with my amendments would mean a capital stock value of \$141 million on which a 3.42 percent annual cumulative dividend would be payable by the seaway.

The annual dividend would amount to \$4,822,000 instead of the \$6 million charge for interest and amortization under the present statute. At today's level of traffic and toll rates, about \$2,500,000 of the dividend could be paid and \$2,300,000 deferred for later payment. At capacity operations of 50 million tons and present tolls, roughly \$6 million would be available for current and deferred dividends. Even at reduced tolls, deferred dividends could be paid off over a relatively short period when traffic reaches the 50- to 60-million-ton capacity levels.

At an annual dividend rate of 3.42 percent, the seaway in about 35 years will have paid over to the Government the same amount as is under present law required to be paid in interest over 50 years. In an additional 30 years, the seaway will have paid over to the Government the equivalent of 100 percent of the capital investment cost.

Mr. Speaker, the seaway's growth will be choked off if the toll provisions of the present act are literally applied. This, the Congress never intended. A sensible readjustment of the seaway's obligations, as here proposed, will permit the seaway to prosper. Not only the Midwest but the whole Nation will benefit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. CRAMER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 31, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1592. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Lower Teton Division, Teton Basin project, Idaho, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 208); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1593. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by the departments and independent agencies, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434) and the act approved June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 377); to the Committee on House Administration.

1594. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of all laws enacted by the Seventh Legislature of Guam, 1963, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1595. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with John J. and Imelda Ferris for operation of El Portal Motor Inn and related services in the El Portal Administrative Site of Yosemite National Park for the period April 1, 1964, through March 31, 1967, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), as amended by the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1596. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting two copies of the 51st Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1963, in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 14, 1903 (5 U.S.C. 604); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 6652. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 587. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 590. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 55; with amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 607. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 84; with amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 597. Resolution providing for printing as a House document, President Kennedy's Thanksgiving Proclama-

tion; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 243. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document in a form suitable for framing of the inaugural address of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 6920. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize issuance of total disability income provisions to national service life insurance policies through age 65, under certain conditions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7932. A bill to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7757. A bill for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9615. A bill for the relief of John A. Peralta; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1206. An act for the relief of George Lou Rader; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1445. An act for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:
H.R. 9791. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program service shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:
H.R. 9792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the manu-

factors excise tax on television sets to alleviate the economic burden on consumers caused by the enactment of the all-channel law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9793. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of post-hospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9794. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9795. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to provide for an exemption for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9796. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Res. 614. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of Senate Report No. 830; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 615. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI-8 incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9797. A bill for the relief of Emilia Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9798. A bill for the relief of Edmundo Jacomo Monteiro De Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9799. A bill for the relief of Calogero Coco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9800. A bill for the relief of Vivencia O. Consing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9801. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Murray-Sanders Constructors and George A. Fuller Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

669. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, Boston Chapter No. 10, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the transfer of the Boston Regional Accounting Office from Boston to New York City; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

670. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., proposing an Easter stamp showing John F. Kennedy, Jr., saluting his father's flag-draped casket as suggested by Representative JOHN E. MOSS; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

671. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to unjust criticism of France; to the Committee on Rules.

672. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting the House to have the Foreign Affairs Committee investigate the possibility of a secret deal between the United States and Russia regarding invading Red China before they get thermonuclear warheads; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Origin System in Immigration Law Must Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Monday, January 13, 1964. My statement follows:

I welcome, indeed, the privilege of appearing before you and having this opportunity to talk on our immigration policy. I appreciate fully the difficult task undertaken by you, a like task which the House committee will undertake soon.

I propose to address myself to Senator HARR's bill, S. 1932, which is identical to the bill I introduced in the House, H.R. 7700, a proposal submitted to the Congress in a special message by the late President Kennedy and supported by President Johnson in his state of the Union message.

Since the enactment, in 1924, of the law which enunciated the restrictive ideology of the national origins theory imbedded in that act and carried forward in the act of 1952, the criticism has been both acute and unceasing. Historians, social philosophers, demographers have pointed again and again to the fallacious reasoning which led to the adoption of the national origins formula.

Forty years of testing have proven that the pattern of discrimination has not only produced imbalances, but that Congress itself, through various acts, has been forced by the realities of a changing world to modify this formula so that today it remains on the books primarily as an expression of gratuitous condescension. In fact, it applies now to only 33 percent of our total

annual immigration and even with regard to that 33 percent it is splintered time and time again by legislative patchwork attempting to prop up a crumbling structure. This committee, as is the House committee, is familiar with the vast number of private immigration bills enacted by every Congress, again emphasizing the unworkability of an anachronistic formula.

I am firmly convinced that this formula would have been changed years ago had a workable substitute been found. In S. 1932 we now have a fair, a realistic and flexible formula which in our own national self-interest literally begs for adoption.

It is no secret to you, nor for that matter to anyone in Congress, that I have been highly vocal in decrying the national origins system of immigration selection. I have sponsored some and followed closely each Act of Congress which fractured the untenable ratio of selectivity that allots annually some 65,000 quota numbers to Great Britain and some 300 to Greece and 250 to Spain.

Congress recognized well what it was doing when it adopted these one-shot acts. Our respective committees were well aware of the legitimate attacks upon that system, but whatever the reason, we chose not to call a spade a spade. In a sense, then, each of the acts of Congress I am about to enumerate has been an act of redemption, the slow retreat from the fears and failures of 1924.

As soon as Nazi Germany's surrender silenced the guns of World War II, the free world awoke to face the overwhelming task of resettling over 1.5 million victims of Nazi and Communist terror, the liberated inmates of concentration camps and Hitler's slave laborers; in short, the mass of humanity stamped "displaced persons." The United States decided to offer hospitality to what was deemed to be her fair share of the unfortunates. However, the national origins formula of the 1924 law remained an unsurmountable obstacle to what the people of the United States wanted to do; namely, to accept the responsibility which the U.S. position of leadership in the world had imposed.

In 1948, the 80th Congress passed the first Displaced Persons Act. Woefully inade-

quate as that law was, it permitted the entry of 200,000 displaced persons outside of the national origins quota limitation, but in spite of the objections of many, myself included, that law imposed an unfair mortgage of the immigration quotas.

The 81st Congress passed the second Displaced Persons Act, sponsored by myself. Once again, the Congress recognized that the national origins quota system must be disregarded if this country were to respond to the public demand and discharge its moral and humanitarian obligations. As a compromise, the unfortunate mortgage feature of the 1948 law was retained.

In 1957, however, under a bill sponsored in the Senate by the late President Kennedy and in the House by my late friend and colleague, Mr. Walter, the mortgage provision was stricken from the statute books in obvious recognition of the fact that the situation created by the simultaneous operation of the national origins system plus the mortgage, had become untenable. Congress knew that the doors to the United States could no longer stay tightly shut for immigrants born in some 11 countries of Eastern Europe which suffered most under Hitler's and Stalin's rule.

The ink was hardly dry on the basic act of 1952 when, early in 1953, the Congress recognized that while the displaced persons and refugees resettlement problems have not yet been solved, the new law, by carrying forward the national origins formula, left this country without any instrumentality to cope with its responsibilities and the emergent needs of the homeless. A new refugee admission law was proposed and quickly passed. It is known as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. It brought to these shores over 220,000 refugees outside of the quota system, outside of the national origins formula and even without the pitiful expediency of the mortgage used in the 1948 and the 1950 enactments.

Just as the two Displaced Persons Acts constituted the first loud and public admission of the obsolescence and the unworkability of the national origins formula of the