

tions only when each nation will speak for itself; when neighboring states or nationalities will not usurp another nation's name and economic resources, as in the case of Byelorussia, whose name is being used by Russia in its international manifestations and blackmailing.

The endeavors of Byelorussians to have the right to speak for themselves and to be their own masters constitute the essence of recent developments in Byelorussia. They become especially obvious among the younger generation of the Byelorussian intelligentsia: among writers, artists, teachers and students. Through their voices and creative talents, the Byelorussian people are striving to rehabilitate their past, of which it was totally deprived during the years of Stalinist terror, and to promote a maximum of political and economic freedom. Taken all together, these aspirations form the core of the idea of independence and democracy as it was promulgated in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

We, the participants of this convention for the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, therefore solemnly resolve—

In the all-out, further struggle for free Byelorussia,

To spotlight the cultural, economic, and political achievements of the Byelorussian people; and

To unmask before the world the political, economic, and moral enslavement of Byelorussia by Soviet Russian imperialism.

May the torch of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic of March 1918 never go out. Long live the free Democratic Byelorussia.

STANISLAU STANKEVICH, Ph. D.,
 National President of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

ULADZIMIER NABAGIEZ, M.D.,
 President of the New York Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

SIARHIEJ HUTYRCHYK,
 President of the New Jersey Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, March 25, 1965, is the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian National Independence Day, a day of great importance to American citizens of Byelorussian descent, as well as for all Byelorussians living in the countries of the free world, and in Byelorussia itself, occupied and oppressed by Soviet Russia today. It is the day on which Byelorussians celebrate the happy period in which their country enjoyed independence.

On March 25, 1918, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian state, but their freedom soon became a prize they had to win on the battlefield. Armed forces of Germany, Russia, and Poland, engulfed the Byelorussian Army from the east and from the west, finally conquering Byelorussia and dividing her territory among themselves.

During the Second World War on June 27, 1944, the Second Byelorussian Congress convened in Minsk. The Congress annulled all treaties of the occupational governments concerning Byelorussia and approved the proclamation of independence for the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. However, Russian power once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 47-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of the 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored in the free countries of the world. Against the mass terror the Russians have used to destroy more than 5 million of their population, against the increased intensity of russification and antireligious campaigns in the press, the Byelorussian people have shown valiant courage and determination. They have earned the respect and admiration of all peoples and have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to Communism. It is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENOCIDE CONVENTIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 11 it was my privilege to address a conference convened in Washington by the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions, a citizens' organization representing virtually every sector of the American community and embracing organizations that can claim to speak for some 100 million Americans.

The Genocide Convention has been languishing in the Foreign Relations Committee now for almost 16 years. Three other U.N. conventions dealing with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor and the political rights of women, have been there almost as long.

I believe that our failure to ratify these conventions projects a most unfortunate image of the United States to the rest of the world. I also believe that much of the opposition to the ratification of these conventions is based upon misunderstanding and misconceptions.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my statement before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions. I hope that my statement will help to throw some additional light on these sadly misunderstood measures. And, I hope too that support can be found to bring them to a vote before this session concludes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED TO RATIFY THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION AND OTHER U.N. CONVENTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Thursday, Mar. 11, 1965.)

Mr. Bingham, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, I have accepted your invitation to address this conference out of a sense of duty because I believe there is no more important item of unfinished business on the calendar of the Senate than the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

It is now 17 long years since the Genocide Convention, with strong American backing, was approved by the U.N. General Assembly. And it is 15 years—almost 16 years—since it went to the Senate for ratification in June 1949.

The convention has been ratified by 67 nations to date, including all the members of the Communist bloc in the U.N. But for some strange reason, the great United States of America, which has done more to extend the frontiers of freedom than any other nation, has not ratified the convention.

In June of 1949, President Truman submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate with his own enthusiastic endorsement.

In January of 1950, a special Genocide Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of a great Connecticut Senator, Brian McMahon, conducted public hearings. It was my privilege to testify in favor of ratifying the convention before this committee. I say it was my privilege not only because of the great importance I attach to the convention but because of the exceptionally distinguished body of citizens, representing more than 50 national organizations, who took the witness stand with me to urge ratification.

In its report to the full Foreign Relations Committee, the McMahon subcommittee strongly recommended ratification of the convention. But despite extensive hearings, despite the declared approval of all the major religious, ethnic, civic, and veterans organizations, the covenant still languishes in the Foreign Relations Committee without affirmative action.

Fifteen years, sixteen years, is a long time to wait for the ratification of any agreement or convention. The long lapse of time, has, I am afraid, blurred our memories and obscured the issues and dulled our conscience. There have been times in our history when the Government has needed prodding, and other times when Congress has needed prodding or intervention from citizens and citizens' organizations. I believe that this national conference, representing as it does every sector of the American community and embracing organizations which can claim to speak for 100 million Americans, constitutes a citizens' intervention in the highest American tradition.

Those of you who have initiated this conference and those of you who have come here to participate in its deliberation will, in my opinion, merit the thanks of coming generations of Americans. This conference, from what I have already seen of it, will unquestionably serve to bring the issue of genocide to life again. And you will, I hope, be able to clear away the intellectual cobwebs that have obscured the issue and encourage the Senate to take the long overdue action of ratification.

What is the Genocide Convention about? In my opinion, there could be no simpler or more fundamental moral issue written into a covenant between the nations of the world.

Essentially, the Convention establishes that genocide is a crime under international law; and it defines genocide as the destruction of a racial ethnic or religious or national group, or part of that group, committed with the specific intent to destroy this group, in whole or in part. It includes the actual killing of members of the group, or causing them serious bodily or mental harm, or deliberately inflicting conditions of life on them calculated to bring about their physical destruction, or forcefully transferring children of the group to another group. It states that these acts are punishable, as well as conspiracy to commit genocide, to direct or publicly incite to commit genocide, or complicity in genocide.

Under article 5 of the Genocide Convention, the contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, legislation which would give effect to the provisions of the Convention and which would establish penalties for persons guilty of acts of genocide.

It seems to me that nothing could be clearer than this.

For me the Genocide Convention has a special personal meaning because as executive trial counsel at Nuremberg I had spread before me, in nightmarish detail, the whole incredible story of Nazi barbarism, of its fiendish persecution of the Jewish people, and of the gas chamber and crematoria that snuffed out the lives of more than 5 million Jews and of millions of Ukrainians, Poles, and other Europeans.

The convicted Nazis were charged with crimes against humanity. The word "genocide" had not yet come into common usage at that time. But to a very large degree this is what the Nuremberg trial was about. For the first time there was spread on the record of an international tribunal the details of massive crimes involving millions of victims—crimes perpetrated not against individuals but against entire peoples and ethnic groups.

While I was at Nuremberg I learned about other acts of genocide that were not made part of the trial record.

I learned of the mass deportations of the Volga Germans and the Kalmuks and the Chechens and other Soviet minority people during the war years.

I learned the true facts about the massacre in the Katyn Forest of 10,000 Polish officers who had been prisoners of the Soviets.

I learned of the mass deportations of scores of thousands of intellectuals and community leaders from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the period following the Soviet occupation.

I learned, in short, that Communist totalitarianism, like Nazi totalitarianism, uses genocide as an instrument of policy, and that the death of nazism did not necessarily mean that we had put an end to the problem of genocide.

Although 67 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention, it has, by and large, remained ineffective, inoperative, and without the necessary authority because the United States has thus far refused to add its ratification.

The years that have elapsed have witnessed situations where genocide has unquestionably been perpetrated and other situations where there was strong prima facie evidence of genocide.

In the case of Hungary the massacre of 25,000 Hungarian freedom fighters by the Red Army and the subsequent mass execution and imprisonment of scores of thousands of Hungarian intellectuals, brought the charge from many quarters that the Soviets were guilty of genocide.

One year later the Chinese Communists crushed the Tibetan revolution with such ruthless measures that the International Commission of Jurists, in its report on the question of Tibet, made the unequivocal statement that Red China had been guilty of the crime of genocide.

In recent years we have witnessed in the Soviet Union a systematic campaign against the Jewish minority and the Jewish religion. While there have been no mass killings of Jews, it is clear that the objective of this campaign is the early and total obliteration of the Jewish religion and of Yiddish culture. Is this genocide within the meaning of convention? This is a matter that might have to be decided by some properly constituted authority. But certainly the allegation of genocide in this case merits the most careful consideration.

In each of these instances the conscience of America has been shocked. We have cried out in protest. Our leaders and our spokesmen have decried the mass killings, and in some cases, they have even used the term "genocide" in referring to the crimes perpetrated by the Communists in these countries.

But the impact of our protest is weakened

and our ability to intervene effectively remains seriously restricted so long as we ourselves have not ratified the Genocide Convention, which makes such acts an international crime.

What is more, I feel that our entire moral position, and our claim to leadership in the fight for freedom and justice and human decency, is prejudiced by our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention and the three other United Nations conventions dealing respectively with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor, and the political rights of women.

What an irony it is that this Nation, which abolished slavery almost 100 years ago, which does not practice genocide at any level of government, which long ago put an end to forced and indentured labor, and whose women enjoy the broadest political rights, should abstain from ratifying these four basic United Nations documents dealing with the rights of man, while the Communist nations, which are guilty on every score, have ratified all of these conventions or most of them.

What a false image of the United States our persistent failure to ratify these conventions projects to the world.

Needless to say, the Communists are clever enough to make use of our failure for the purpose of challenging our commitment to freedom and blackening our reputation. Among the newly emerging nations of the world, regrettably, the most widely believed facts about the United States are frequently those purveyed by radio Moscow or Peiping.

For example, in January of 1964, there was a debate in the UN subcommittee on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities. The Soviet member strongly opposed the establishment of international machinery for reporting upon and encouraging the elimination of racial and ethnic discrimination. At every point he was on the defensive. Finally, he decided to go over to the offensive.

The Soviet spokesman suggested that it was rather hypocritical of the American delegate to charge the Soviet Union with resisting the establishment of implementation machinery when "the United States had not ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide or the Convention on Slavery."

The American delegate had to reply in embarrassment that he could only "regret of course that my country has not ratified the Convention on Genocide."

I am certain that as this exchange was reported over radio Moscow and radio Peiping, primitive peoples around the world were led to believe that the United States was opposed to ratification because it practices slavery and practices genocide.

It is time—high time—that we put an end to this invidious situation.

In the words of our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, "The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny."

There is only one way out of this dilemma. The Senate of the United States must at the earliest opportunity act to ratify the Genocide Convention and the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women.

I know that some Senators have expressed the opinion that these measures will fail of ratification because we cannot get two-thirds of the Members of the Senate to vote for them. With this point of view I strongly disagree.

This conference has demonstrated in the most dramatic possible manner that the American people, in their overwhelming majority, favor the ratification of the four U.N. conventions dealing with the rights of man. I am confident that, given the necessary

leadership, and given a patient exposition of the facts to the Members of the Senate, the Senate will not only ratify these measures, but will do so by a very substantial majority.

And I want to pledge to you that during the months to come I shall make this one of my chief objectives both within the Foreign Relations Committee and within the Senate itself.

There is one final proposal I would like to make. Looking forward to the time when the Genocide Convention has been ratified, I think we must start thinking in terms of practical measures to make it effective.

As the convention now reads, each nation ratifying the convention undertakes to enact legislation to implement the convention, and it also provides that any person charged with commission of an act of genocide should be tried by a court of the state in whose territory the act was committed.

These articles of the Convention, in my opinion, constitute the most effective answer to those who charge that ratification of the convention would result in a surrender of our sovereignty to some unnamed and nonexistent international tribunal. But the articles leave something to be desired because it is questionable whether any Communist states can be trusted to prosecute their own nationals for the crime of genocide. And it is also questionable whether any state, Communist or democratic, will, in our lifetime, voluntarily agree to submit matters of such significance to the judgment of an international tribunal. I believe this is so despite the fact that no democratic state has practiced genocide or will practice it.

How then can we give effect to the Genocide Convention?

There is an approach to this problem which would involve no surrender of national jurisdiction, but which would be more effective as a deterrent to genocide than the present provisions of the treaty.

The United Nations has been at its best when it has been a matter of setting up an investigative committee to establish the facts in countries like Greece, or Hungary, or South Africa, or Borneo, or Vietnam. Invariably, these committees have reported objectively and fearlessly.

When the Genocide Convention is ratified, I would like to propose that serious thought be given to establishing a continuing investigative mechanism within the United Nations, under which serious allegations of genocide would lead to the appointment of special committees with the instruction to investigate and report back.

The member nations of the U.N. would be obligated to cooperate with such committees in any investigations conducted on their territory. The committees would have no juridical power, nor would the U.N. itself. But the mere power of investigation—the power to seek out the facts and bring them to public light—would, in my opinion, operate as a powerful deterrent to genocidal crimes and to other violations of human rights.

If the U.N. could be endowed with this responsibility by the consent of its member nations, it would give the world organization new meaning and a new lease on life.

I submit these thoughts for your consideration because I am confident that the Genocide Convention will be ratified, and the time is, therefore, arriving when we must begin to think of next steps.

I wish you godspeed in your deliberations.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is particularly fitting that the Senate should pay tribute to the Greek nation on the

5838

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 25, 1965

introduced is not intended in any way to be a substitute for an omnibus bill or to delay in any way an omnibus bill, because it is my understanding that the Committee on Public Works does intend to proceed with hearings on new projects under an omnibus bill in the very near future.

We invite those who are in the basins affected by this legislation introduced today to join us in seeking the quickest possible consideration and approval of this legislation.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to join in the introduction of this legislation. It is absolutely essential at this time. I trust Congress will take immediate action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY THROUGH EDUCATION

(Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, having been assured by a high authority that H.R. 2362 would be brought to some conclusive action today, I confirmed long-standing arrangements to participate in the wedding ceremony of my daughter, Virginia, to Dr. James Mount. The wedding is taking place in Akron, Ohio.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported all of the truly constructive educational bills that have been introduced in Congress. As my remarks of yesterday must indicate, I cannot support H.R. 2362, as it has been presented.

Early this March, I requested the House Rules Committee to withhold action on this bill until my educational bill, H.R. 6349, could be considered. This bill was also introduced by Representatives CURTIS and GOODELL. I would call your attention to that introduced by Senator ABRAHAM RUBINOFF.

It is unfortunate that the House is not to have the opportunity to vote on this legislation. H.R. 6349 would certainly bring about equality of opportunity through education—however, the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has advised me that his bill would not be germane to H.R. 2362, as a substitute.

Meetings with the minority assure me that the plans for the corrections of the many inequalities of H.R. 2362 are in most capable hands. The very Members who shall offer amendments and opposing action on H.R. 2362 are the very same Members who have so ably added corrective amendments to other legislative matters that have successfully been enacted into law.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF GRANT AND LEE AT APPOMATTOX

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

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 9, is the 100th anniversary of one of the most important dates in the history of our Nation. One hundred years ago on that day, Gen. Robert E. Lee and Gen. Ulysses S. Grant met at the conference table at Appomattox, Va., and negotiated peace terms between the North and the South. I know of no event of more importance to our Nation since our Constitution was adopted. It represented the uniting of a war-torn nation, the healing of a breach, the welding together of a great people, the rebirth of a nation.

There will be conducted at the Appomattox Court House National Historical Park commemorative services honoring these two great men, Generals Lee and Grant, as well as the peace that was achieved that day 100 years ago. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, a grandson of General Grant, and Robert E. Lee IV, a great-grandson of General Lee, will take part in the ceremony dedicating the restoration of the old court house where the Confederate soldiers were mustered out after the peace terms had been agreed upon. Mr. Bruce Catton, the author of "A Stillness at Appomattox," a noted scholar, and Pulitzer prize winner as well as a great historian, will deliver the address. The Marine Band from Quantico will provide the music. The Governor of Virginia and many other notables will be present.

On behalf of the people of Appomattox in particular and Virginia in general, I extend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives a cordial invitation to attend these exercises as our guests and to visit this great shrine which stands as an emblem of peace between our people and in memory of those great warriors who fought, bled, and died for principles they believed in and were willing to sacrifice their all in defense of same.

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON NAZI WAR CRIMINALS AND GERMANY'S RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us are gratified today by the news that the West German Parliament has extended the statute of limitations on the prosecution of Nazi war criminals for 4 years. I know that all of the members of the Jewish community recognize this as a further demonstration of responsibility on the part of the West German Government.

We are equally pleased at the eminent prospect of an exchange of ambassadors between West Germany and Israel. The West German authorities are to be highly congratulated for their response to the dictatorial demands of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. This courageous action deserves tribute from all of us who have supported the cause of the State of Israel.

These actions—the recognition of Israel and the extension of the statute of limitations—are in stark contrast to the position taken by the Soviet puppet

government in East Germany. That government has done everything possible during the past 20 years to create chaos in Europe. From the Berlin airlift to the Berlin wall, East Germany has demonstrated the lack of interest of its Soviet masters in securing peace and a reunified Germany.

Concomitantly, East Germany has done nothing whatever to atone for Germany's crimes during the Second World War. No Nazis are being tried or traced behind the Berlin wall. Very little co-operation in making records of the Nazi period available has been received from behind the Berlin wall. No restitution has been made to the Jewish victims of nazism from behind the Berlin wall. No help has come to Israel from behind the Berlin wall.

What has come from behind that wall? A pledge of \$100 million from believers in freedom throughout the world welcome the actions of both Israelis and Germans in demonstrating to the free world that morality is a function of government and that blackmail must not be yielded to.

We commend all freedom-loving people everywhere who joined in the effort to convince the Federal Republic of Germany to act as properly as it has.

We salute the high-minded officials of that Government for once more standing up for the right.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the Byelorussians, a people who have been cursed by the misfortunes of geographic determinism; for there is no doubt that if their country had not been situated within the shadows of Great Russian power, Byelorussia would probably be an independent nation-state today.

Geographic determinism is a principle in politics that can work to the advantage or disadvantage of nation-states. We Americans were singularly blessed by the geographic fact that during our formative years we were isolated by and large from the incessant political struggles that plagued modern European states. And when we were sufficiently strong, we were able to make our entry on to the world political scene with more than a reasonable assurance of success.

But, nations like Byelorussia have never enjoyed the benefits of geography. Caught up in the crossfire of the Teutonic-Slavic struggle, they never had the choice to achieve their national aspirations in an atmosphere of political serenity. In fact the only respite they enjoyed as a nation came with the dissolution of Russian power and at that time they declared their independence. But with the reemergence of Russian power in the form of Soviet communism, Byelorussian independence was doomed.

On this day of national dedication we join with freemen the world over in renewing our pledge to the universal hope of self-determination of all peoples.

March 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5837

decrease the number of underprivileged youths who can participate.

Second, because this wage is in many cases higher than that provided by local industries not covered by Federal minimum wage legislation, the youngster may be earning more than his parent. This could encourage dropouts—the very thing this bill is designed to avoid.

This is only one instance among many that makes one wonder why Congress labors long and conscientiously to enact sound, constructive legislation only to see it go down the drain because of inept, bullheaded application.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 business of the American people today is education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362) is an essential step that we must take.

If we are to keep faith with our forefathers, we here today have an obligation to the younger generations, and those yet to come, to provide the opportunity for the best education possible in order that they may be properly prepared to assume positions of responsibility and leadership which will one day be theirs. The teachers in our public school systems, the elementary and secondary schools, do more than educate our children. They are, in fact, the primary guardians of our democratic heritage. Therefore, the strength of our Nation will depend in the future, as it has in the past, on the strength of our elementary and secondary schools.

No one can deny the fact that we must do everything within our power to give local school districts of limited financial resources an opportunity to provide every child—those who come from families with such limited incomes—an opportunity for a solid foundation in the basic education of skills.

It is with deep respect that I pay highest compliments to the Honorable CARL D. PEAKINS, of Kentucky, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, for his dedicated service and untiring efforts which resulted in our consideration of H.R. 2362.

In particular, the formula that he has proposed for financial assistance is equitable and fair and it will provide our local school districts with the essential finances which they so desperately need in order to properly fulfill their responsibilities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the Members of the House will pass this historic legislation exactly as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, without a single amendment.

MAPLE SYRUP RESEARCH

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

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, it was announced on December 31, 1964 that a research program costing \$285,400 to further improve the quality and reduce the cost of producing maple syrup would be discontinued. The explanation for this decision was that the returns on the research dollar of the USDA would probably be higher in some other area. In view of the spectacular results of the past research program on maple syrup it is felt that there is no further place to go with maple syrup research.

The research financed by the USDA, costing about \$1,500,000 since 1948, has indeed produced spectacular results. It can very well be said to have preserved the industry, and kept maple syrup on our tables.

Here are some of the most spectacular accomplishments:

First. The yield of sap per tree has been increased 60 to 80 percent.

Second. The flavor quality per gallon of syrup has been increased four times.

Third. The factors causing offgrade syrup have been found and eliminated.

The net effect of this research to the farmer will be, once it has been fully applied, a sixfold increase in the value of the product from his sugarbush.

In 1964, the value of maple products produced in the United States was \$8 million. Production was the highest in the last 9 years, and so was the price. This means that maple products, unlike many farm products, has a very high elasticity of demand, and that if production is increased further, the effect on price will not be great. Increased production will result in increased farm income—without Government supports.

These areas of research need further work, and justify a continuation of this program:

First. Methods for storage of sap without deterioration: The unpredictability of occurrence and amount of maple sap flow often results in the production of sap quantities far in excess of the capacity of evaporating equipment. This necessitates the storage of sap for periods of 4 to 6 days and results in deterioration of the sap. Current practices permit satisfactory storage for a maximum of 24 hours. Methods should be developed to provide for the delivery of sterile sap to the evaporation storage facilities. Better methods of sap handling and sanitation in the woods, in transit, and in plant storage tanks are needed.

Second. Expansion of studies already initiated on the adapting of food processing plant equipment and modifying sirup making procedures: This work should be expanded so that more food processing plants can be converted to maple sirup production during their idle period. This was recommended by the Forestry Research Advisory Committee at their meeting in November 1964.

Third. Improvement in the efficiency of sap evaporating equipment: The cost of evaporating maple sap to sirup is one of the major items in maple sirup production. A further lowering of evaporation costs is essential to the lowering of the price of sirup.

Fourth. Identification of the flavor potentiator(s) in maple sirup: Preliminary studies have indicated the presence of a flavor potentiator(s) in

maple sirup. Work should be initiated to discover its nature and identity. The production of this food potentiator could provide new and expanded outlets for maple sirup.

Fifth. Studies on the nature and properties of maple flavor precursors: This will provide information necessary for further improving sirup manufacturing methods. The identity of the precursors of maple flavor and tests for identifying them would be of great value to the Forest Service in their selection and propagation of maple trees for maple sirup production.

Sixth. Methods are needed for the culturing, stocking, and commercial distribution of cultures of organisms required for the development of enhanced maple flavor by controlled fermentation.

Seventh. Methods to prevent the formation of sugar sand in sirup: Methods need to be developed that will remove the formative agents of sugar sand from sap or sirup. This could be done by use of a chelating agent to be added to the sap or sirup or by ion exchange techniques. In either case the treatment must in no way affect the maple flavor.

In the middle of February, in Michigan, we begin to get our first thaws. The sun, on a clear day, begins to give its warmth to us again. The rough black bark of the sugar maple absorbs the heat of the sun's rays, and on the south side of the trees the sap begins to stir. This is the time we tap the tree, and join in the resurgence of life as winter begins to melt away. The trees give of their mellowed sweetness through the month of March, until their buds are swollen and their flowers burst into bloom, throwing their pollen to the bees and to the winds.

I hope we may continue to help these hardy men who love their maples to learn more about them, so that the bounty which they give us will continue to increase. I trust the Department of Agriculture will reconsider its decision.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 43, I was recorded as not voting.

Due to my attendance at a meeting in my district relative to the preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House as a national historic site, I was delayed in returning to Washington. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

BASIN AUTHORIZATIONS

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of us who serve on the Committee on Public Works have joined today in introducing a bill to provide a 1-year extension on basin authorizations for 10 basins in the country which face the situation in which the authorizations will be exhausted in the very near future and appropriation requests therefore would be imperiled.

We wish to make it very clear that this basin authorization bill which is being

March 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5839

MARYLAND DAY

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

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Maryland Day, 1965 marks the 331st anniversary of the founding of the colony that has become one of the great States of the Union. In the course of 331 years Maryland has given the Nation and the world many concepts that are now basic principles of modern thinking. Religious toleration and the right of women to participate in political activity were, for example, both asserted in 17th-century Maryland.

In 1965 we shall mark the bicentennial of an event in Maryland history that has few parallels in its importance to all of America. A tax to be raised through stamps required for legal documents was imposed on the American colonies by the British Parliament in 1764. As most taxes are, the stamp tax was unpopularly received, but in addition it raised the constitutional questions of "taxation without representation" and the extent of the legislative powers of the Parliament at Westminster over the colonies of British America. Discontent was expressed through the organization of the "Sons of Liberty" and the adoption of resolutions of protest.

In Maryland the reaction to the Stamp Act was rational, forceful and highly significant. The greatest patriot interest in the colony was expressed in Frederick County, the mother county of western Maryland, whose boundaries then included all that now comprises Montgomery, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties and much of Carroll County. The 12 judges of Frederick County rendered an opinion that the court should proceed with its business without the controversial revenue stamps, and it so ordered its clerk. This action won immediate and vigorous approval. The dean of Maryland historians, James McSherry, in assessing the importance of the judicial action said the "Frederick County Court had the high honor of first deciding, in a legal manner, the unconstitutionality of the Stamp Act."

McSherry further reports:

This decision was received with joy; and the people hastened to celebrate so important and significant an event. The festival took place in Frederick, on the 30th of November, 1765. The "Sons of Liberty," in funeral procession, in honor of the death of the Stamp Act, marched through the streets, bearing a coffin, on which was inscribed: "The Stamp Act, expired of a mortal stab received from the Genius of Liberty, in Frederick County Court, 23d November, 1765, aged 22 days." Zachariah Hood, the late unfortunate stamp distributor, was chief mourner, in effigy, and the whole affair ended merrily in a ball.

Mathew Page Andrews in his "History of Maryland" adds some interesting details in describing the repudiation:

On December 10, in a supplement entitled "an apparition of the late Maryland Gazette," the editor announced that the magistrates of Frederick County had resolved that business should go on without stamps, on the plea that the Stamp Act had not "been legally transmitted to them." This decision of the magistrates was celebrated in Frederick Town by an elaborate pageant or public parade.

Such proceedings served to attract popular attention to the principles under discussion. On this occasion, pursuant upon the colors, drums, and a banner proclaiming the independent action of the magistrates, there came inscriptions such as "Magna Carta," "Charter of Maryland," "Trials by Juries Restored," "Oppression Removed," "Liberty and Loyalty." Finally, there appeared a coffin with the legend: The Stamp Act, expired of a mortal stab received from the Genius of Liberty in Frederick County Court, 23d November, 1765—aged 22 days.

Charles Albro Barker, in "The Background of the Revolution in Maryland" calls the court's order the "first sign" of resistance:

The first sign that the colony would disregard the tax came from Frederick County, in November. The county judges decided that, since they had never received official notice of the Stamp Act, they would proceed with the regular business of the court, as if they had no reason to believe that special circumstances existed. The decision was celebrated in a fitting manner. Self-styled "Sons of Liberty" of Frederick town honored the judges with a ball and many patriotic toasts. They buried the Stamp Act in a mock funeral, where the only mourner was an effigy of Zachariah Hood.

The political consequences of the ferment that arose because of the Stamp Tax are probably unequaled in all history. The constitutional principles of representative government and political self-determination which were to justify the revolution in the next decade were made household words throughout America by the intense interest aroused by the Stamp Act.

A less recognized aspect of the action of the Frederick County Court was the impact upon judicial as well as political precedents. Although the court adopted a lawyers' pretext for its action, there is no doubt from contemporary reaction and from all the surrounding circumstances that the court fully understood and appreciated the importance of its decision in repudiating the Stamp Act. McSherry is right in saying that the court labeled it "unconstitutional," and not worthy of obedience.

Thus we find jurists in America even before the foundation of the Republic who had the courage to be independent of the power that elevated them to the bench. The Frederick County Court, a remote tribunal in a distant province placed so great an importance on "liberty" that it struck down the decree of an imperial parliament, and reinforced the power of courts to protect the rights of a people even against its own rulers.

The repudiation decision is, therefore, a great judicial precedent in America and one of the important steps toward the establishment of our State and Federal system of judges independent of either executive or legislative control.

The court was justly revered in its own day and has been given recognition for all of these two centuries. In 1894 the General Assembly of Maryland declared that November 23 should be a legal holiday in Frederick County. In 1904 a memorial to the immortal judges was erected in the present Frederick County Courthouse. It is important to remember each of them: Joseph Smith, Samuel Beall, Thomas Price, William Lockett,

David Lynn, Joseph Beall, Andrew Heugh, James Dickson, Charles Jones, Peter Bainbridge, William Blair, and Thomas Beatty.

Today I have introduced a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to proclaim November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day in recognition of the great significance of the action of the Frederick County court as a preamble to the American Revolution, and to further bear witness to the importance that we still place upon a judiciary that has the courage to be independent and the wisdom and strength to protect the liberties of the people against every sort of tyranny.

5840

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 25, 1965

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

[Mr. O'HARA of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous material.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED PUBLIC RECORDS LAW

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his

The existing law provides for withholding of information relating to the "internal management of an agency," but this has permitted secrecy regarding matters such as budget procedures.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Legal Services and Procedure reported that under the "internal management" exemption, "hundreds of interpretive regulations contained in the claims manual of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were not published nor otherwise made available to the public; these were the very same rules which governed the settlement of more than 2 million claims a year."

Under existing law, if a Government agency can find no other basis for withholding information, it can resort to the vague and all-encompassing concept that the information be held "confidential for good cause found."

As a result of these problems, Government agencies have been able to withhold substantial amounts of information from the public, and I want to submit, Mr. Speaker, that this situation, together with the generally expanding centralized authority in the Federal Government, constitutes a real threat to the continued strength of our democratic system of government.

Excessive control of information about a government always accompanies the assumption of excessive power by that government, and the survival of our representative system depends on a continuing public access to information about the Government.

The proposed bill would require that a Federal agency would have to prove its right to withhold specific records. Persons seeking Government information could file suit in a U.S. district court which would have the authority to order the production of agency records improperly withheld and would have the power to punish agency officials for contempt if they refused to disclose the records.

Federal Government records which would be exempted from the disclosure requirements would include national defense and foreign policy secrets specifically protected by Executive order, documents relating to internal personnel rules and practices of an agency, privileged trade secrets, agency memoranda dealing solely with matters of law or policy, personnel and medical files, investigatory files compiled for law enforcement, and certain reports used by agencies responsible for regulation of financial institutions.

Activities and decisions of the Federal Government should be open to full scrutiny of citizens. But too often we are confronted with bureaucrats who seem determined to keep the business of Government under a rug of secrecy.

The management of news has become an accepted procedure in almost every departmental office, from top to bottom, in the administration.

A public records law is badly needed so that citizens will be better able to determine whether Federal agencies are acting in ways which are responsive to the needs and wishes of the people.

EDUCATION

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, although I have spent over one-half of my life in the field of politics, I consider still that my profession is teaching. I began my teaching career in a one-room school with all eight grades at Opperman, Ohio. I taught in a junior high school in Cambridge, Ohio. I was principal of the high school for 4½ years in my home town of Senecaville, Ohio. I resigned in January 1931, to serve in the Ohio State Legislature. I was superintendent of schools at Murray City, Ohio, when I was elected to Congress in 1932. I resigned the first of March in 1933 to take my seat in Congress. I realized then, as I do now, that the hope of my country rests upon the character and education of the young people who, generation after generation, assume the burdens and the privileges of citizenship in our Republic.

Education has made great strides since I taught my last class in school. In spite of this progress, the incentive and the opportunity for education is seriously lacking in our country. In spite of all the money spent by local taxpayers and States, 8 million adults in the United States have completed less than 5 years of school. School dropouts are setting an all-time record which primarily accounts for the fact that 20 percent of all young people between the ages of 18 and 24 years, are unemployed. When we compare this figure with the national average of unemployment somewhere near 5 percent, we can only conclude that something more is needed. The population explosion has crowded our schools to the point where individual attention to a pupil such as I received as a student and gave as a teacher, is no longer possible. It is shocking to note that of all young men called up under the Selective Service System, 21.6 percent were rejected because they could not pass the fairly simple mental tests uniformly given throughout the country.

The burden of building new schools and operating them has raised real estate taxes to the point where the property owner cannot be expected to assume greater and greater burdens. Federal aid to primary and secondary education has long been discussed by educators and nearly every interested group in our Nation.

Two things have been uppermost in the minds of all our citizens. The first is the fear that the Federal Government would attempt to control education in the local school districts. Under H.R. 2362, all funds will be distributed through each State to local school authorities, who will determine what use will be made of all Federal funds. I am convinced that the Federal Government through this bill will have no more control over the operation of local schools than they have had under the vocational education program which has been in existence for many decades. The use to which Federal funds will be applied will be determined solely by the school authorities