

The net effect of the Senate amendment is that sole surviving sons will not be drafted in times of peace or during an emergency declared by the President, but sole surviving sons will be liable for induction in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress after the proposed legislation becomes law.

AMEND MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "1964" and insert "1965".

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the same question I asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], namely, are all of the amendments to this bill germane to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. I will explain the amendment to you. It is merely that the subsidy provision expires tonight. This amendment changes the House bill from extending the subsidy 2 years to the Senate provision which extends it 1 year. So we agreed with the Senate and it will be an extension of 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PROPOSED NEW AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE FOR COOPERATION IN THE EXCHANGE OF ATOMIC INFORMATION WITH THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND ITS MEMBER NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and without objection was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 16, 1964, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, jointly recommended to me, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, a proposed new agreement to provide for cooperation in

the exchange of atomic information with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations.

The new agreement will supersede an existing agreement executed in 1955, and will do two things:

(a) It will extend the types of information which we can exchange with NATO. This expanded area of information is needed to enable our Allies to make effective use of nuclear delivery systems being provided them by the United States under bilateral procedures and agreements following creation of NATO atomic stockpiles in 1957.

(b) It will permit NATO member countries to share in information which the United States has hitherto been exchanging only with the NATO organization itself under the 1955 agreement. This will make these countries' role in alliance planning in the nuclear field more effective.

This new agreement thus represents a logical and useful step in our continuing and varied efforts to ensure wider Allied participation in NATO nuclear defense. Such wider participation is necessary on both military and political grounds. It is needed to enhance the effectiveness of NATO defense. On political grounds, it is needed to reinforce NATO cohesion by meeting our Allies' legitimate desire to make a constructive contribution to nuclear defense.

Therefore, I have authorized the Secretary of State to execute this new agreement between the Government of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member nations to provide for the cooperation relevant to the exchange of atomic information for NATO planning purposes.

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, together with a letter from the Secretary of State, a copy of the joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of the agreement, and a copy of my approval memorandum.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1964.

ANNUAL REPORT OF ALIEN PROPERTY OFFICE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and without objection was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To The Congress of the United States:

I am sending for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1964.

THE CARNATION AS OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my Colorado colleagues of the House and I have today introduced legislation to authorize the selection of the carnation as our national flower.

Undoubtedly, this vast Nation has been endowed with many natural beauties which could readily lay claim to such a title, but the carnation, with its history, growth, and development seems to symbolize the character of America.

The heritage of America included the inheritance of the fragrant, herbaceous perennial known to us all as the carnation. Technically a native of southern Europe known as the *Dianthus caryophyllus*, the carnation is a simple garden flower which has flourished as well in a wild state in England.

Universally recognized for its simplistic beauty and fragrance, the fringed blossom of the carnation may be solid or striped or laced with color. Sometimes known as the colorful gillyflower, it has been acclaimed by Chaucer, Spenser, and Shakespeare. It was, indeed, the latter who dubbed these fragrant beauties "The fairest flowers o' the season."

Others, of course, will advance their own fair beauties, and I could take no exception; however, if our national floral emblem is to be a symbol representative of America, it should be kept in mind that:

The carnation, a perennial, knows no season and is available always in all areas of the Nation.

The carnation, a floral beauty with no thorns or thistles, is as distinctive as it is democratic—it fits equally well in the setting of the family mantle and a state dinner at the White House, it is equally acceptable for wear by both men and women, it is adaptable to all occasions from wedding banquets to floral remembrances.

The carnation, as a truly national flower, would be a natural choice of the distinctive American character.

Mr. Speaker, although my native State, Ohio, has chosen the carnation as its State flower, no nation has yet named it as its floral emblem. If this Nation is to be so represented, it could wisely select this beautiful blossom as its national flower.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN].

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, many flowers have been proposed as the official national flower. The spectrum of suggestions runs from the rose to the corn tassel. Each flower has its strong advocates and compelling arguments that support its claim to the honor of being the national flower.

The national flower, however, should reflect the many moods and facets of

the American people. It should be both ornamental and utilitarian. It should not be confined to a single season or a single area. As a national flower it should represent the Nation.

The national flower should be dignified, yet bright; colorful to fit the most joyful occasion and somber to fit the most solemn. It should be the symbol of joy and happiness; of commemoration and remembrance.

In cool, colorful Colorado we specialize in the cultivation, growth and perfection of the crisp, cheerful carnation. This beautiful flower is equally at home in the winter corsage, worn at the Christmas ball; in the summer bouquet, decorating the Sunday evening table; as the groom's boutonniere and the bride's nosegay; and as the commemorative flower on Mother's Day.

We are a people of many moods. We are sometimes gay and carefree; we are sometimes solemn and contemplative. We are aware of history's lessons of the past and we are eager to walk into tomorrow.

The carnation fits each and all of these moods. I respectfully suggest it is the perfect choice as the national flower and have today introduced a bill with my colleague from Colorado on this subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues [Mr. CHENOWETH and Mr. ROGERS], be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join my colleagues from Colorado in urging that the carnation be designated as our national flower. I have today introduced a bill that would give the carnation this distinction, and national recognition.

The carnation is a lovely flower and is a favorite everywhere in this country. We are very proud of the fact that Colorado grows the finest carnations in the Nation. These carnations are shipped to every part of the country and Colorado carnations are always in great demand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bills my colleagues from Colorado and I have introduced today will receive favorable consideration, I am sure there would be general approval if Congress should pass this legislation making the carnation our national flower.

We are indebted to the carnation growers of Colorado for the lovely flowers you are wearing today. I am pleased that you could enjoy these carnations and observe their great beauty. I hope you are now fully convinced that the carnation should be our national flower.

[Mr. ROGERS of Colorado addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Belt
IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced that testimony from the executive agencies on pending immigration legislation would begin on Wednesday, July 1, with the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as our opening witness. A change has been made in the date for the appearance of Secretary Rusk to Thursday, July 2, due to an engagement of Secretary Rusk with the President of Costa Rica on the prior date.

Testimony from interested Members will be concluded today and the record of hearings will be open for the next 10 calendar days so that Members who have not appeared before the subcommittee may file statements to be included in the first part of our record of hearings, which, as previously announced, was set aside for Members of Congress to testify or present statements for inclusion in the record of hearings.

In the event that Members may wish to testify this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if it is anticipated that we will hold hearings during the week beginning July 6?

Mr. FEIGHAN. No, I have not made any decision, because I am waiting to find out whether or not we shall have a recess beginning on the second.

Mr. POFF. Then, do I understand if the House stands in recess during the week of July 6, we will not hold hearings during that week or the week beginning July 13?

Mr. FEIGHAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I feel it would be highly inadvisable to hold hearings at that time because of the inability of the members of the subcommittee to be present.

Mr. POFF. I am afraid that the answer of the gentleman is not quite responsive to my question. We should have some definite assurance that there will not be hearings scheduled during the week of July 6 or the week of July 13. I am awaiting the answer to that question.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the first instance, I believe the gentleman will agree that whenever hearings have been held before, they have been held with the mutual understanding and consent of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. That is true, and I am grateful for the cooperation that has been shown me. Yet I must ask for a positive response to my question concerning the week of July 6 and the week of July 13.

Assuming that the House stands in recess during those 2 weeks, is my understanding correct that we will not hold hearings?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, July 1, 1964, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

THE 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PERMANENT SETTLEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 400 years ago today, June 30, 1564, the permanent settlement of our country began. It began with the saying of prayers of thanksgiving and the digging of earth in what is now northeast Florida.

Yes, 1564 not only saw the birth of Shakespeare in England, the death of Michelangelo in Italy and the death of Calvin in Switzerland. It was not only an age and a year unparalleled in literature, in art and in religion, but it was also the year of our beginning.

The 16th century has been justly called the golden age of discovery. As such, it was the product of the development of the science of navigation and the courage of its great navigators, who opened up the New World for settlement. For us Americans, 1564 was indeed a banner year for it marked the very beginning of the permanent settlement of what is now the United States.

It was Rene de Goulaine de Laudonniere, a French Huguenot sea captain who pulled off this event. He headed the Fort Caroline Colony for France's Queen Mother Catherine de Medici, discovered gold for the royal treasury in the Appalachian Mountains and experienced starvation with his colony when the promised aid from France did not come about. His critics said of him that he was more of a pilot than a Governor. He thwarted repeated efforts to stab him, to cudgel him, and to blow him to bits. In the colony's starving times he allowed no one to touch a feather of the colony's hundred chickens, saved to populate the farmyards of posterity. He observed:

It was necessary for a Governor to make himself known and obeyed lest everyone would become the master.

Against Laudonniere's northeast Florida colony, Fort Caroline, Spain's King Phillip II sent Pedro Menendez de Aviles, admiral of the Spanish Armada and a crafty and firm man who drove Laudonniere from Fort Caroline and established