I know that you, as members of this great organization, will welcome this opportunity for service to your country and will accept the challenge under the leadership of our great President. With your help we will not fail in the great task that lies ahead.

I have never posed as a political expert. Most of my experience has been in other fields. Yet I have always felt that what is right is good politics. And I know that this administration is firmly dedicated to what is economically, morally, an spiritually right. I wish I might take each one of you into a Friday morning Cabinet meeting that you too might feel the spirit of your administration in Washington.

"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God." These words of George Washington, spoken before the Constitutional Convention, are as sound today as they were in 1787.

Yes, there is a new look in Washington today and the Nation is better off because of it. Government costs have been cut. Taxes have been reduced. Inflation has been halted. Living costs have been stabilized.

We have proven that it is possible to have peace and prosperity at the same time. The transition from war to peace has been made with fewer dislocations than most people thought possible. The economy is prosperous and stable. The trend toward centralized controls has been reversed. Bureaucracy is on the decline. There is less looking to Washington for direction and more of a feeling of pride and responsibility in the States, counties, and local communities. Integrity, honesty, and efficiency in government have been restored.

But we have only made a start. The crusade for honesty, integrity, and efficiency in government must go on.

Some of the grave decisions which lie ahead may not be ours to make. The Communist aggressors who have enslaved half the world give little indication that they will be content with less than all of it. We may have to live with this constant threat for many years.

However difficult the road ahead may appear, however discouraged we may become in our diplomatic dealings with men who recognize neither truth nor compassion, we must for the sake of all humanity continue to seek a peaceful solution to the seemingly insoluble problems of our age. At the same time, we must remain strong—strong economically, strong socially, and, above all, strong spiritually—strong enough to meet this ever-present threat of new Communist aggression. To be strong, we must remain productive, for it is the almost unlimited productivity of our Nation which stands as the great barrier against the Red onslaught.

We must hold high America's bright-burning torch of freedom that one day it will surely dispel the shadows of ignorance and despair now blanketing the minds of communism's slaves.

May God strengthen us in that resolution.

The Poor Man's Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the big tax-revision bill of the 83d Congress, completely rewriting the tax code, which after a desperate fight became Public Law 591, is, in effect, a poor man's bill.

Those who would make political capital for purely political purposes by attacks upon this magnificent measure have called it a rich man's bill. The exact opposite is true. It's a poor man's relief law.

Now we have an abortive attempt to kill several of the most important parts of the 1954 tax legislation, all of which favored the lower income groups; but the attack on these favoring measures is being made by those who assert they are fighting the battle for the little man. Actually, they would hurt the little man, the average wage-earner, and the millions of people on small fixed incomes, small pensions, and especially the white collar workers.

Opponents of the administration would extend the excise tax law 2½ years instead of just 1; therefore, they would be guilty of taxing the little man, the poor man, the fixed income people, and the pensioners, an extra year and a half on such necessities as light bulbs, telephone calls, transportation, handbags, cosmetics, gasoline and many other everyday needs, of some of which we had hoped to unburden them at the end of the year. Does this proposed measure sound like relieving the little man?

They would again soak the little man, the poor man, and the pensioner by again double-taxing him on his meager dividend income. The vast majority of millions of stockholders are little people whose income is the result of hard work and lifetime savings, invested in a few shares of corporate stocks. To millions of these people, this is their only income. The law written last year gives 100 percent relief to those in the lowest income bracket, 67 percent in the next group, 52½ percent in the next group, and tapers down to only 11 percent to the wealthy, who are relatively few in number. Why soak these millions of little people and claim you are soaking only the rich? Isn't that the height of deception? Does that sound like relieving the little man?

Now most of you are not kidded about this corporation tax measure. Only people pay taxes. Corporations, actually being groups of people, cannot exist unless they pass along taxes in the prices of their production. If they do not, they go broke and throw thousands of people out of work. So if you extend, as the opponents of the administration are now proposing, the 52 percent corporation earnings tax to 2½ years instead of 1, you are again taxing millions and millions of the people that pay for the goods and services produced by the corporation. Does that sound like relieving the little man?

And then, this politically inspired $20 and $10 tax cut amounts to 40 cents a week or 20 cents a week per individual. How much relief is that going to give the average individual? And yet it will cost your Treasury over a thousand million dollars, which added cost must be raised by deficit financing, which means bank borrowing, which is tantamount to the printing of that much new money, which in turn causes inflation and penalizes most deeply the people in the lower income bracket. The rich man can afford $100 per year increased cost of living from inflation, but the little man—those on fixed incomes and pensions—would be cruelly hurt every time we allow inflation to creep in. Does this sound like relieving the little man?

It is hard to conceive this poorly disguised attempt at cheap politics which so obviously hurts the lower-income people by repealing tax relief given them by last year's Congress. It was bad enough to call that great tax revision measure a rich man's bill, but to attempt to repeal some of the parts of it most important to poor people, seems the height of hypocrisy.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, as in this forum of national deliberation we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of violence and of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be sure and steady, their hope in Thee as an anchor that is steadfast and their faith unshaken, that out of the ruin and wreck of today Thou art making all things new. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT, RELATING TO REGISTRATION FEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MAINTENANCE OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATELY OWNED PLANTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the Act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES OF PRIOR ACTIVE SERVICE OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VOLUNTEER CIVILIAN MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering claims paid during the 6 months' period ended December 31, 1954, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SQ-TYPE RADAR SET TO AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the American University of Beirut had requested the Navy Department to transfer one SQ-type radar set, to be used for educational purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENT ON PAINTING OF WAR HOUSING PRIOR TO DISPOSITION

A letter from the Executive Director, National Capital Housing Authority, Washington, D. C., transmitting a statement on painting of war housing prior to disposition, referred to in the report on the audit of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in the Olympic National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Ninth Annual Report of operations under the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at Washington, D. C., September 22–24, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department for the calendar year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1941 PERTAINING TO EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL WORK

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the observance of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail

"Whereas by act of Congress, dated March 3, 1857, the Postmaster General of the United States was, for the first time, authorized to contract for the conveyance overland, from the Mississippi River to San Francisco, Calif., of all letter mail; and

"Whereas until that time the conveyance of letter mail to the Pacific coast had been by the long, slow, arduous ocean route fraught with danger from storm and sea and totally dependent upon the vagaries of the wind; and

"Whereas the opening of service upon the overland route authorized by Congress was the culminating event of a series of events of prime importance not only to the development of the West and California, but also to the development of the United States; and

"Whereas centennial celebrations of these events should be fittingly observed throughout the length and breadth of the Nation for from the modest 'four-horse coaches, or spring wagons, suitable for the conveyance

of passengers, as well as the safety and security of the mails,' required by the act, have developed our modern systems of communications which bind the East and West into one great Nation; and

"Whereas the American Association for State and Local History has undertaken the national sponsorship of centennials and has established regional committees to plan such centennials; and

"Whereas a regional committee has been set up in California which is known as the 'California Committee, Overland Mail Centennials, 1957–1958': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to insure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the celebration of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges that all State and local governmental units; public schools; civic, patriotic, and historical societies; and all agencies of communication do participate wholeheartedly in the observance of the celebration of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail by cooperating fully with the California Committee, Overland Mail Centennials, 1957–58, in commemorating the acts, the accomplishments, and the memories of those sturdy pioneers who engineered the beginnings of overland communication between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby commend the American Association for State and Local History for its action in undertaking on a national scale the sponsorship for the centennial observances of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby respectfully request that the Governor of the State of California transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Speaker of the House; to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress; to the governors of the several States and Territories; to the board of supervisors of each California county; to the mayor of each incorporated city; to the titular head of the American Association for State and Local History, American Historical Association, Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, California Historical Society, Historical Society of Southern California, Conference of California Historical Societies, California History Foundation, Native Sons of the Golden West, Native Daughters of the Golden West, National Committee for the Overland Mail Centennials, and California Committee for the Overland Mail Centennials."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to the Caryl Chessman case and writs of habeas corpus

"Whereas on or about January 11, 1955, the Chief Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit stayed execution of a judgment imposing the death penalty on Caryl Chessman, convicted sex terrorist and kidnaper; and

"Whereas this infamous criminal has been convicted of 17 felonies as a result of jury verdicts and the criminal record upon which the conviction of this depraved person is based is so shocking that it is hereby briefly summarized:

"January 3, 1948: (1) First degree robbery.

"January 13, 1948: (2) Grand theft of an automobile which was used in perpetrating subsequent crimes and in which Chessman was fleeing when he was apprehended.

"January 18, 1948: (3) First degree robbery

"January 18, 1948: (4) First degree robbery.

"January 19, 1948: (5) First degree robbery. (6) First degree robbery. (7) Kidnaping of a female person for the purpose of robbery with infliction of bodily harm; punishment fixed at death. (8) Violation of California Penal Code Section 288a, relating to a crime of sex perversion, committed against a female person ((7) above).

"January 20, 1948: (9) First degree robbery.

"January 22, 1948: (10) Attempted robbery. (11) Kidnaping a female person for the purpose of robbery with infliction of bodily harm; punishment fixed at death. (12) Attempted rape of a female person ((11) above). (13) Violation of California Penal Code, section 288a, relating to a crime of sex perversion, committed against a female person ((11) above).

"January 23, 1948: (14) First degree robbery. (15) First degree robbery. (16) Kidnaping a male person for the purpose of robbery, with infliction of bodily harm; punishment fixed at life imprisonment without possibility of parole. (17) Kidnaping a male person for the purpose of robbery.

"Each of the above paragraphs represents a separate general criminal enterprise, in each of which one or more offenses were committed. The jury further found that Chessman was armed at the time of the commission of each of the crimes except that of grand theft, No. (2) above; that he was armed at the time of arrest; and that he had been twice convicted previously, once for robbery, and once for assault with a deadly weapon; and

"Whereas one of the female victims of this brutal and fiendish sex pervert suffered a mental breakdown which permanently deprived her of soundness of mind, requiring her confinement in an asylum where she remains to this day; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the State of California affirmed the decision of the trial court, upholding the judgment of conviction of the 17 felonies; and

"Whereas our Anglo-American legal history apprises us of our righteous sensitivity to the fact that, in the course of ordinary legal procedures, men may occasionally be convicted of a crime through no fault of their own. Nevertheless, cases of the Chessman type forcibly remind us of the inadequacy of the postconviction procedures which have been erected to guard against the contingencies of improper conviction when such procedures have the effect not of releasing the convict but of clogging the courts with the fraudulent and unfounded claims of the guilty; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has come to realize the gravity of this situation by remarking in the case of *Wade* v. *Mayo* (334 U. S. 672 (1948), note 51, 681–682):

" 'Statistics compiled by the administrative office of the United States courts show that during the fiscal years of 1943, 1944, and 1945 there was an average of 451 habeas corpus petitions filed each year in Federal district courts by prisoners serving State court sentence; of these petitions, an average of but 6 per year resulted in a reversal of the conviction and a release of the prisoner. The releases thus constituted only 1.3 percent of the total petitions filed'; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States as recently as the year 1952 has again recognized this situation in a note to its decision in *United States* v. *Hayman* (342 U. S. 205), at pages 212–213 that:

" 'In several districts, up to 40 percent of all applications for habeas corpus filed during the years 1943, 1944, and 1945 were so-called repeater petitions'; and

"Whereas Chessman has compiled an astonishing record in his relentless and seemingly unending pursuit of postconviction remedies. Chessman has been turned down by the California Supreme Court on his appeal from the trial court and has been refused 3 applications for a writ of habeas corpus in the same court; he has been rejected by the United States Supreme Court in 5 applications for a writ of certiorari, or review; he has been denied 5 times by the United States district court on applications for a writ of habeas corpus; he has been turned down previously by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on an appeal from the district court; and

"Whereas Chessman has been refused executive clemency upon several occasions both by Gov. Goodwin Knight and by former Gov. Earl Warren, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court; and

"Whereas the prostitution of our legal procedures by this depraved sex terrorist brings sharply into focus this aberration in the law of postconviction procedures; and

"Whereas the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has prepared and urges the adoption of a uniform postconviction procedure act designed to remedy the defects in State court procedures; and

"Whereas the Federal law with respect to the writ of habeas corpus should be made the subject of a congressional study for the purpose of devising more adequate safeguards for society as well as the wronged individual by amendment of the appropriate Federal laws now permitting a convicted person serving a term in a State prison to repeatedly clog the calendars of the Federal courts with petitions for writs of habeas corpus: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to undertake an investigation and study of the Federal laws relating to the repeated use of the writ of habeas corpus by convicted persons serving terms in State prisons with a view to providing a limited right in the Federal courts to entertain such writs consonant with the due-process-of-law requirements of our Federal Constitution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the compensation of postal employees

"Whereas employees of the United States Post Office Department have received but one wage increase since 1949, which increase failed to compensate them for the great increase in the cost of living that has occurred since 1949; and

"Whereas most other public and private employees have received wage increases which more nearly enable them to meet the increased living costs; and

"Whereas any increase in the cost of living particularly affects postal employees because of their relatively low wages; and

"Whereas postal employees should receive an increase in wages not only because such an increase would be equitable but also because the efficiency of the postal system would be enhanced thereby: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation for an increase in the compensation of postal employees commensurate with existing costs of living; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to the extension of veterans' benefits

"Whereas the very foundation of the governmental system of this Nation is the principle that all persons similarly situated are entitled to and shall be given equal treatment within the law; and

"Whereas this Nation has ever held as inviolate its obligations both formal and implied to those persons serving in its Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the citizen soldier who is drafted today is being deprived of equal benefits by way of veterans aid to education as have been received by those persons drafted but a short time before even though he is asked to make much the same, if not identical, sacrifices as were made by those veterans; and

"Whereas many persons today in the Armed Forces volunteered with the implied and, in many instances, stated promise that they would receive educational benefits commensurate with their length of service; and

"Whereas it would be dishonorable and unjust to fail to keep faith with those serving our Nation in the Armed Forces during this hour of need; and

"Whereas many draft boards have urged young high-school graduates and others to volunteer for induction as soon as possible so that the time spent in the service would not break into a school year and emphasizing that the few months of education thus sacrificed would be more than amply repaid by the veteran's educational benefits; and

"Whereas the failure to provide educational benefits for the present-day citizen soldier is not only a failure to fulfill agreement with its citizens serving in the armed services but also is a failure to keep faith with those citizens serving on our draft boards who have contributed immeasurably to the success of the selective-service system; and

"Whereas such action is a blot upon the sacred honor and integrity of this Nation which if allowed to remain will jeopardize the future of the selective service system at a time when the perils facing this Nation are as grave as any it has ever been called upon to face: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to restore the educational benefits for present and future service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to the Sacramento River Ship Channel

"Whereas the Sacramento River Ship Channel project was authorized by Congress in 1946 in Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session, and construction started in 1949 with the completion date scheduled for July 1953; and

"Whereas the California State Legislature by Chapter 1152, 1947 Statutes, approved and adopted the project for navigation and flood control on the Sacramento River in cooperation with the Federal Government in accordance with Senate Document 142, 79th Congress, 2d session; declared the State interest therein; provided certain powers and duties of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District and the Department of Finance in connection therewith; provided for the acquisition of certain property rights therefor; and made an appropriation; and

"Whereas the State of California has a total investment of approximately $1 million in the project at the present time, including as a phase of the West Sacramento Freeway the Harbor Boulevard overpass to the port terminal area; and

"Whereas the Sacramento-Yolo Port District voted $3,750,000 in bonds for local participation, and has sold $1,750,000, and is presently burdened with amortization of those bonds; and

"Whereas the port district has constructed a grain elevator, belt railroad, and highways, with the grain elevator leased to private grain merchants who are depending upon completion of the deep-water channel for successful operation of the grain elevator; and

"Whereas private local businessmen and farmers, depending upon early completion of the project, have invested $2,500,000 in private warehouses, elevators, and other works adjacent to the port area; and

"Whereas the Federal Government required the Sacramento-Yolo Port District to give assurance that local interests would meet requirements in the act of authorization, and the port district has met each and every one of those requirements; and

"Whereas construction was stopped at the outbreak of the Korean war, after completion of 4 miles of channel north of Rio Vista at a cost of $2,548,000 to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the deep-water channel when completed will serve more than 20 counties in the northeastern part of California north and east of Sacramento: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, to take such steps as may be necessary to resume construction on this project immediately, and to make an appropriation sufficient to defray the cost of such work as can be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers during the 1955–56 fiscal year; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the House and Senate Appropriation Committees for Civil Functions, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Army."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to the Forest Service

"Whereas the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture was created by Congress on March 3, 1905; and

"Whereas, the Forest Service is charged with the responsibility of promoting the conservation for best use of the Nation's forest lands, which comprise approximately one-third of the total land area of the United States; and

"Whereas the service administers approximately 150 national forests, extending over 180 million acres in 40 States and Alaska and Puerto Rico, and improves them, protects them from fire, insects and disease, and manages their resources for orderly and continuous service and for the maintenance of stable economic conditions in the national forest communities; and

"Whereas the service applies technical methods of forestry to the growing and harvesting of timber; scientifically regulates the grazing of livestock to obtain range conservation along with the use of the annual growth of forage; manages watersheds for the regulation of streamflow, reduction of flood danger of soil erosion, and the protection of water resources for power, irrigation, navigation, and municipal and domestic supply; provides for recreation; and proceeds scientifically in the development and maintenance of wildlife resources; and

"Whereas the States and private owners of forest lands receive the cooperation of the Forest Service in the application of sound management practices, in the maintenance of organized protection of forest lands against fire, and in the distribution of plans to farmers for windbreaks, shelter belts and farm woodlands; and the service cooperates with the States in stimulating the development, proper administration and management of State forests; and

"Whereas in carrying on its activities the Forest Service has fully justified the fondest hopes and expectations of its founders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the State of California hereby congratulates the Forest Service on this, the fiftieth year of its existence, and expresses its recognition and appreciation of the splendid work that has been and is being done by it in the attainment of its objectives; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of California, the Department of Agriculture, and the Forest Service."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the field of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States,

and the House of Representatives of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Wyandotte, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Paul Kramer, of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the restyling of the facade of the Department of Justice Building in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, San Bernardino County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for processing Federal Housing Administration loans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolution adopted by the 42d international convention of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, at Cincinnati, Ohio, relating to a revision of the Taft-Hartley law, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota and other States of the upper Midwest and Northwest have been seriously upset in the last few days by the extent to which the White House appeared willing to completely override the findings of the Civil Aeronautics Board and deprive one of our major airlines an international route it has pioneered, in order to provide a monopoly for a heavily subsidized competing line.

I refer to the originally announced decision of the President regarding operations of Northwest Airlines in the transpacific renewal case.

We are grateful, of course, that after a storm of protest from Minnesota and other States the President last night partially modified his order to permit continuation for 3 years at least the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii service by Northwest.

Yet even that is a far cry from the permanent certification the CAB recommended by a 5-to-0 decision, a modification obviously granted reluctantly under political pressure and in no way changing what appears to be the basic attitude of this administration toward international air routes.

It is regrettable that the semijudicial functions of the CAB are being bypassed by the White House. It is unfortunate that political favoritism and a leaning toward monopoly control seems to be injecting itself into issues that should be settled on an economic basis in the full spirit of our free-enterprise system, and in accordance with the intent of Congress in creating the Civil Aeronautics Board. This may well be a trend some of our appropriate committees of the Congress may find worth looking into in more detail.

Another important issue affecting the economy of the Midwest is still unresolved. It is the question of permanent certification of Northwest for the inside route from Minneapolis-St. Paul to Anchorage, Alaska, as a link in international travel from New York to Tokyo. If Northwest is deprived of this route, more than an airline is hurt. It may well mean loss of a vital route to United States carriers, and mean turning that route over to Canadian carriers. If so we will be sacrificing a link in the shortest route from New York to the Orient. Many of us shall be watching closely the pending final decision on this inside route.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the house of representatives of the Minnesota Legislature on February 4, requesting the President of the United States to reconsider his earlier action relative to Northwest Airlines.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House resolution requesting the President of the United States to reconsider action relative to Northwest Airlines

Whereas Northwest Airlines is an important segment of the economy of the State of Minnesota and the upper Midwest; and

Whereas Northwest Airlines has pioneered air service between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii by which it has developed a substantial community of interest between such islands and the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas it appears that Northwest Airlines is to be deprived of its charter to continue such service; and

Whereas the loss of such charter will be a serious impairment to the economy of Minnesota and the upper Northwest; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board recently decided by unanimous decision to renew Northwest Airlines' charter to continue its airline service between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii; and

Whereas the President of the United States has directed the Civil Aeronautics Board to reverse its action and to deny the renewal of Northwest Airlines' charter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the President of the United States be most respectfully requested to reconsider his action wherein he requested the Civil Aeronautics Board to reverse its decision to renew Northwest Airlines' charter to operate air flights between Seattle and Honolulu for the reasons that failure to renew the charter of Northwest Airlines will work a great hardship upon the said airlines; will injure the economy of the State of Minnesota, and will seriously impair essential transportation services in the upper Midwest; be it further

Resolved, That an enrolled copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and to each member of the Minnesota congressional delegation, Washington, D. C.

ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, the 4th day of February 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the people of America noted with deep interest the comments by President Eisenhower in his health message regarding our increased contribution to the World Health Organization, a great institution which has performed tremendous service throughout the world.

I present a resolution which I have received from Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, secretary of the American Dental Association along this same line.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 4, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The American Dental Association, which has a total membership of 82,000, adopted, at the recent session of its house of delegates, the following resolution which it desires to call to your attention:

"*Resolved,* That the interest of the American Dental Association in removing the present ceiling on this Nation's assessment for the World Health Organization be expressed to the Members of the Congress of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

The association is deeply interested in the provision of additional support for the program of the World Health Organization and earnestly solicits your cooperation in achieving that objective.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD HILLENBRAND, D. D. S.,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present two resolutions which were adopted by the Great Lakes Harbors Association on September 14, 1954.

One of these resolutions rightly opposes the notorious Chicago water steal—a subject on which I see our friends from the Chicago area commented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day with their customary vigor but with regrettable inaccuracy.

The other resolution rightly supports the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels and the necessary improvement of port facilities.

I heartily endorse the comments in both of these association resolutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION, SEPTEMBER 14, 1954

Whereas President Eisenhower has vetoed H. R. 3300 which would have permitted additional diversion of waters from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system through the Chicago Drainage Canal; and

Whereas the Great Lakes Harbors Association feels that it is in the best interests of the Great Lakes area to preserve the integrity of the levels of the Great Lakes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Great Lakes Harbors Association expresses its unalterable opposition to any proposed legislation which purports to circumvent or defeat the United State supreme decree of April 21, 1930, which authorizes diversion at Chicago of 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage; further

Resolved, That the proper forum for applications for increased diversion is the United States Supreme Court which has expressly retained jurisdiction over the matter of diversion of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence water system; further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the official records of the association and that copies thereof be sent to all Members of Congress and the United States Senate.

Whereas Congress at each session considers many requests for appropriation of funds for the improvement and development of waterways in all sections of the United States; and

Whereas the Great Lakes constitute the greatest inland waterway in the world, with low freight rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be requested:

1. To continue its appropriations of funds in an amount sufficient to complete the study already authorized and now being undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of the Great Lakes levels, their effect, their control, damages caused by high levels, and the like.

2. To appropriate at the next session of Congress funds sufficient to improve and develop the connecting channels between the upper and the lower lakes in order to provide minimum depths of 27 feet so as to permit the large foreign and domestic ocean-going freighters to navigate Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Superior when the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed.

3. To appropriate funds sufficient to deepen the channels in the harbors on the Great Lakes which will require deepening in order to be ready for the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

4. To appropriate funds sufficient to permit the port cities on the Great Lakes to maintain their harbors in a proper condition from year to year; further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the official records of the association and that copies be mailed to each Senator and Congressman from the States bordering upon the Great Lakes.

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter I have received from the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Bozeman, Mont., enclosing a resolution adopted by that association favoring the continuance of the Federal soil-conservation program.

I urge my colleagues to pay very careful attention to the resolution, because it embodies the thoughts of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
MONTANA STATE COLLEGE,
Bozeman, Mont.

To All Members of the United States Senate.

HONORABLE SENATORS: The Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts in their 13th annual business meeting in Butte, Mont., November 30 and December 1, 1954, adopted the enclosed resolutions and directive that it be sent to you.

Respectfully submitted.

REX F. CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

Whereas the Federal Soil Conservation Service, working with soil conservation districts has accomplished outstanding success in putting conservation on the land; and

Whereas the Federal Commission on Conservation and Agriculture has recommended that this program be relegated to the various States with a "grant-in-aid" status; and

Whereas the present corps of Soil Conservation Service technicians would be gradually shifted to the status of State employees: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts object to this recommendation and support and urge all efforts to the end of retaining the present program as a Federal service for the following reasons:

First, the idea is financially impracticable because a number of the States, including Montana, have, in the past, been unable to make sufficient appropriations to meet their obligations on other similar grant-in-aid programs such as Federal highways and other worthwhile projects.

Second, a good program must be based and dependent on well-trained and educated personnel who can be assured of the security and permanence that only the civil-service status could provide. Many would not accept employment by the States.

Third, that a high standard of achievement could not possibly be obtained in all the 48 States under separate programs.

Fourth, the benefits of a nationally administered program of soil conservation accrues to all people; be it furthermore

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to every Member of both Houses of Congress, to the Governor of Montana, to our State legislators, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States.

Whereas Public Law 566, commonly known as the Watersheds Protection and Flood Prevention Act, is designed primarily to furnish financial assistance for prevention and control of floods; and

Whereas only a very limited number of projects can be justified in Montana on the basis of flood prevention alone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to so amend the act as to permit both Federal financial and technical assistance in making beneficial uses of floodwater prior to giving consideration to structures for flood prevention. In the West where water for irrigation is of primary importance because of the semiarid climate, and flood conditions are usually caused by a combination of mountain snow-melt and rainfall during the spring season, followed generally by drought conditions, the storage of sufficient water to carry crops through the summer is the major problem and should receive primary consideration. Structures to handle floodwaters in excess of irrigation requirements are necessary but should be made the secondary objective of most projects in this and other States of the semiarid West; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Montana and other Western States' congressional delegations, the chairmen of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, the president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the Governors of the State of Montana and other Western States, and the chairman of the State Soil Conservation Committee.

REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received from the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board, of St. Paul, Minn., a letter transmitting a resolution adopted by that board favoring the repeal of the transportation tax. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWEST SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 1, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your attention is directed to the attached resolution adopted by the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board at its 32d annual and 110th regular meeting held in St. Paul, Minn., January 26, 1955, in connection with the repeal of the transportation tax on passenger, sleeping-car accommodations, and freight.

In conformity with instructions given me by this board, I am passing this resolution to you for your consideration and action toward fulfilling the views expressed therein.

Very respectfully yours,

W. C. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NORTHWEST SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD AT ITS 32D ANNUAL MEETING, ST. PAUL, MINN., JANUARY 26, 1955

REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX

Whereas the transportation tax on passenger and sleeping-car accommodations was a war measure to discourage travel; and

Whereas the transportation tax on freight was a war measure to increase revenue for the conduct of World War II; and

Whereas this board has repeatedly pointed out that the tax on passenger and sleeping-car accommodations has passed the need to discourage travel and the tax on freight is a burden on transportation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board reiterate its previous action on these two matters and respectfully request its secretary to transmit its opposition to these taxes to all Members of Congress from the States comprising this board area.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 587. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 26).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games in Detroit, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 27).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 967. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DUFF, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 968. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 969. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 970. A bill for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 971. A bill to stabilize farm incomes by providing a system of insurance to indemnify farmers against certain losses occurring in the operation of their farms; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 972. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 973. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 974. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 975. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the invaluable service rendered to the United States by Amelia Earhart Putnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 976. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 977. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 978. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 979. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 980. A bill to provide a system of scholarships for persons of unusual ability in certain sciences; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 981. A bill to assist the enforcement of State laws licensing insurance companies, by prohibiting the use of the mails to evade such laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 982. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act; and

S. 983. A bill to provide grants to municipalities in those States which are parties to the Ohio River Valley sanitation compact to aid in the construction of sewage treatment works to prevent pollution of waters in the Ohio River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 984 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. WELKER):

S. 985. A bill to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 986. A bill to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 987. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 988. A bill to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 989. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to certain lands in Hancock County, Miss., conveyed as swamp and overflowed lands by the State of Mississippi to private individuals in 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 990. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Aron Katz and his family;

S. 992. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carreri; and

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Eugene Alexander Figueiredo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 994. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 995. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Hans Kuzura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 997. A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 998. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 999. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1000. A bill for the relief of Andrius Kuprevicius; and

S. 1001. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Pavlides (Harry Pavlos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1002. A bill to increase the amount of guaranty by the Veterans' Administration on certain home loans made pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1003. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1004. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1006. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in firefighting activities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1007. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Schrater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1010. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. POTTER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MAINTENANCE OF MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to be the cosponsor of the bill (S. 3610) to provide for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., as a permanent Federal institution. A similar bill passed the House and was reported favorably by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but that action came at such a late date that it prevented the Senate from taking up this measure prior to adjournment in August.

Today, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I introduce for appropriate reference a similar bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the background and nature of this legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 967) to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. HENNINGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

On behalf of myself, and Senators IVES, WILEY, and HENNINGS, I am introducing a bill which would amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

This Academy, located at Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., has been in existence since 1938. Since that time it has established an enviable record of providing trained midshipmen for the United States merchant marine. Members of this body who have from time to time served on the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy can attest to the fine facilities and reputation which the Kings Point academy possesses, not to mention the splendid caliber of young men who have graduated from this Federal institution.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to maintain the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point on a permanent basis for the instruction and preparation for service in the merchant marine of selected persons as officers. The importance of the merchant marine cannot be overstated, particularly in these critical times. With the responsibility for proper operation of the merchant marine follows the duty to see that this merchant marine is properly manned by qualified officer personnel. This the Federal academy at Kings Point has been doing to a great extent and will do even more completely with the establishment of the academy on a permanent basis as a Federal institution.

During the past couple of years much confusion has arisen within and without the Academy concerning the future of that institution. This has had the unfortunate but inevitable result of adversely affecting the morale of the students and of the faculty. In the words of the report of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on a similar bill last year: "As one witness stated, one of the undoubted assets of the school is an indefinable esprit which certainly is not encouraged by continued rumors and acts which indicate an uncertain future. In order to meet this problem, the subcommittee is of the opinion that the Merchant Marine Academy should be recognized as one of the group of academies training young men for the service of their country and to that end should receive status equivalent to that of the Military, Naval, Coast Guard, and Air Academies."

Last year's House bill was similar to one which I was pleased to cosponsor with Senator WILEY and Senator IVES. The House bill, H. R. 9434, passed the House on July 30, and was reported in the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on August 18. Unfortunately, because of the press of business so close to the August 20 adjournment date, it was impossible to obtain Senate approval of this bill at that time.

I am pleased to know that three distinguished Members of the House have in this Congress already introduced bills identical to the one which I introduce today. Chairman BONNER of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has jurisdiction over this legislation, is the sponsor of one of these bills. Another was introduced by Congressman VAN PELT, who, in the 83d Congress, was chairman of the House subcommittee handling this matter. The third identical bill was introduced by Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, of New York, who has long demonstrated his great interest in and devotion to the cause of the American merchant marine. I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the House in sponsoring this measure in the 84th Congress.

I hope that this Congress will be able to act favorably upon this legislation which is of importance not only to young men interested in serving in our merchant marine, but of greater importance to the country in its efforts to provide an adequate number of properly trained officers for the merchant marine.

At this time, I wish to take this opportunity to point out that my bill in no way jeopardizes the continuance of the State maritime colleges which have done such a splendid job of graduating young merchant marine officers for such a long period. These four schools, located in New York, California, Maine, and Massachusetts, have their distinct part to play in the important task of adequately manning our merchant fleet. I and many of my colleagues in the Senate have been greatly disturbed by the President's budget recommendation that no funds be appropriated for fiscal 1956 as the Federal share of maintaining these four State maritime schools. I intend to support efforts in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor, if necessary, to provide Federal funds to these State schools as we have for so many years. Indeed, I feel that the bill which I am introducing today serves only to emphasize the importance of training officer personnel for the merchant marine, and both the Federal and the State maritime colleges are equally necessary.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill reflecting in legislative form the special message on emergency school construction, which we have just received from the President. I am happy to have as cosponsors of the bill the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

I also invite any other Senators to join in cosponsoring the bill, and ask unanimous consent that their names may be added any time today.

The Presidential message delivered this morning is of extreme importance, for the unprecedented classroom shortage we are now facing is, as President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message, "of immediate concern to all our people."

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as its first item of business in the 84th Congress, commenced public hearings on bills relating to Federal aid to school construction. At the opening of the hearings I stated that Congress must proceed with dispatch in the consideration of such proposed legislation. I also stated that final Committee action on the problem would hardly be appropriate until we had re-

ceived, studied, and considered the President's recommendations.

We have now received those recommendations, which were made after thoughtful study and consultation with experts in the field, in both public and private life. I am convinced that the approach recommended today by President Eisenhower is much to be preferred to the straight grant-in-aid proposals now before the Committee. The President's program will do a bigger job better, and, in my opinion, just as quickly, as any proposal heretofore made. In addition, and of the first importance, is the fact that the vital interests and responsibilities of the States and local communities in the field of public education are more perfectly preserved by these recommendations than by any program for general Federal handouts, with or without matching provisions.

President Eisenhower's recommendations are entitled to the thorough study and consideration of the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of all other Members of the Senate, and of the public, to the end that the Senate may enact the best possible solution to meet this emergency need. With somewhat more leisure, the Congress can study the results of the State and White House conferences on education and the results of other studies soon to be forthcoming, in order to determine the proper role of the Federal Government in public education over the long run.

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced will, if enacted, provide:

First. For the purchase by the Federal Government of bonds issued by local school districts to finance school construction, where such bonds are not marketable to the public at reasonable rates of interest.

Second. For support by the Federal Government, in association with the States, of the bonds issued by State school building agencies established to finance the construction of buildings for rental to and eventual ownership by local public school systems.

Third. For Federal grants-in-aid, matched by the States, to enable local school districts to qualify for 1 of the 2 forms of assistance previously described.

Fourth. For Federal grants-in-aid, matched by the States, to meet administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction or to furnish State advisory and financial aid to local public-school systems.

Several points deserve reemphasis. I wish to emphasize that enactment of this bill, first of all, would make possible a tremendous volume of new construction. Over the next three years, the bill will make possible the joining of local, State, and Federal resources, amounting to $7 billion, which would result in approximately 200,000 new classrooms, to house close to 6 million children. Second it should be made clear that this bill will permit the building of schools as fast as would be permitted by any alternative program now under consideration. Third the bill is completely voluntary in its provisions. In the fourth place it is comprehensive and is designed to meet the varying needs of our varied school districts and their problems. Fifth, it fully preserves local initiative and local responsibility.

I commend to the earnest consideration of my colleagues the President's message and the bill I have just introduced.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary of its provisions, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 968) to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1955."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) free public education is of fundamental importance to the self-governing citizens of a free democracy;

(2) in the United States of America, public education has been from the earliest times the right and the responsibility of the States and communities;

(3) the growth of our population and the enforced curtailment of construction during the years of war and defense mobilization and other factors have combined to cause a serious shortage of public elementary and secondary school facilities;

(4) despite the efforts of local communities, which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level, there is still a serious national shortage of public school facilities;

(5) the local communities are often, in their efforts to expand school construction to the extent required, confronted with obstacles in applying their potential resources to their needs, including an inability to borrow the necessary funds at reasonable rates, restrictive debt and tax limits, uneconomical school districting and similar matters;

(6) while overcoming these obstacles is primarily the responsibility of the States and communities, the Federal Government, recognizing the Nation's interest in our public school system, can and should take all appropriate steps, consonant with State and local responsibility, to help the States and communities meet their emergency school construction needs.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide assistance of a substantial and effective nature to States and communities which are handicapped by the shortage of public school facilities, through—

(1) purchase by the Federal Government of obligations issued by local educational agencies to finance school construction where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest;

(2) support by the Federal Government, with the participation of the States, of the obligations issued by State school building agencies established to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to and eventual ownership by local educational agencies;

(3) Federal grants to the States to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for the assistance described above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities;

(4) Federal grants to the States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction.

TITLE I—FEDERAL PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MARGINAL CREDIT

PURPOSE

SEC. 101. For the purpose of assisting local communities to construct public elementary or secondary school facilities, the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commissioner") may purchase obligations of local educational agencies, as hereinafter provided, to aid in financing the construction of such facilities by such agencies.

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS PURCHASED

SEC. 102. The total of the obligations of a local educational agency purchased under this title with respect to any school facilities may not exceed the Federal percentage, determined under the succeeding sentence, of the cost of constructing such facilities. The Federal percentage for any local educational agency in a State shall be 100 percent minus that percentage which bears the same ratio to 40 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (1) the Federal percentage shall in no case be more than 80 percent or less than 50 percent, and (2) the Federal percentage in Hawaii and Alaska shall be 60 percent, and in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be 80 percent. Such Federal percentages shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce, and the percentages so promulgated shall be conclusive for purposes of this title.

TERMS OF OBLIGATIONS; LIMITATIONS

SEC. 103. (a) (1) Obligations purchased under this title may be either general or special obligations of a local educational agency, shall be purchased at par or face value, shall be in such form and be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 30 years, as may be determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the quarterly rate which the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify as applicable to the calendar quarter during which obligations are purchased by the Commissioner, plus one-half of 1 percent.

(2) The quarterly rate applicable to each calendar quarter shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month preceding such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month, and by adjusting such estimated average yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(b) Not more than 15 percent of the sums appropriated under this title for any fiscal year shall be available for purchase of obligations of local educational agencies in any State.

(c) No obligations may be purchased under this title after June 30, 1958.

CONDITIONS TO PURCHASER OF OBLIGATIONS

Sec. 104. Obligations of a local educational agency may be purchased under this title only upon application by the State educational agency to the Commissioner certifying that—

(a) such local educational agency is, as evidenced by a public offering of such obligations, unable to obtain the funds necessary to finance the cost of construction of the school facilities involved from other sources upon reasonable terms and at the interest rate applicable to obligations purchased under this title;

(b) there is an opinion by a qualified attorney that such obligations have been legally issued and are binding on such local educational agency;

(c) the school facilities to be constructed with the proceeds from the sale of the obligations are needed for current or reasonably anticipated enrollments, are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies, and will be undertaken in compliance with applicable State construction laws and standards;

and including such additional information as may be necessary to make a showing, satisfactory to the Commissioner, that such local educational agency is financially able to pay such obligations as they become due.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 105. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and the next 2 fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $750 million, as may be necessary for the purchase of obligations as authorized by this title. Payments of principal and interest by local educational agencies on obligations purchased by the Commissioner under this title shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, as miscellaneous receipts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 106. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(a) sell or exchange at public or private sale, upon such terms and at such prices as he may fix, any obligations purchased by him under this title;

(b) subject to the specific limitations in this title and where necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States, consent to the modification, with respect to the time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other terms of any obligation, contract, or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title; and

(c) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure payment of obligations purchased under this title.

ACCOUNTING AND AUDITS

Sec. 107. The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this title—

(a) prepare annually and submit a business-type budget as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

(b) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited anually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act.

(c) determine the character and necessity of expenditures under this title and the manner in which such expenditures are incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the provisions of law specifically applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

TITLE II—FEDERAL CREDIT ASSISTANCE TO STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AGENCIES

PURPOSE

Sec. 201. For the purpose of assisting States desiring to do so to issue and market obligations to finance the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities for rental to, and ultimate ownership by, local educational agencies, the Commissioner is authorized, as provided in this title, to enter into agreements, on behalf of the United States, with State school building agencies for making advances to reserve funds established by such agencies to help assure payment of such obligations.

AGREEMENTS WITH STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AGENCIES

Sec. 202. The Commissioner shall enter into an agreement with the State school-building agency of any State only if

(a) such agency is empowered to enter into an agreement with the Commissioner under this title and otherwise comply with the provisions of this title,

(b) the governor of such State certifies to the Commissioner that methods for securing effective coordination between such agency and the State educational agency have been provided, and

(c) the State law empowering such agency to take the action referred to in clause (a) authorizes payment by the State, subject to and within the limits of appropriations made available for the purpose, of advances for deposit in the State account of the basic reserve fund (or funds) of such agency equal to the amount withdrawn pursuant to the agreement from such account in any year (other than the year in which occurs the latest maturity date of the obligations).

ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 203. (a) An agreement pursuant to this title shall provide that the State school-building agency shall establish and thereafter maintain a basic reserve fund and a supplemental reserve fund with respect to each issue of obligations, which funds, so long as any such obligations remain outstanding, shall be held in trust for and irrevocably pledged to the payment and retirement of such obligations.

(b) Where so provided in the agreement at the request of the State school-building agency, such basic reserve fund, or such fund and such supplemental reserve fund, may be established with respect to two or more issues of obligations; and in such case such issues shall, to the extent provided in the agreement, be regarded as a single issue of obligations.

STATE ADVANCES TO BASIC RESERVE FUND

Sec. 204. Such agreement shall provide for establishment of the basic reserve fund with respect to an issue of obligations on or before the date of delivery of any such obligations to the purchasers thereof, and for deposit by the State therein, upon establishment of such fund, of an amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on such obligations. The amounts so advanced, plus any amounts subsequently advanced by the State thereto, together with any interest thereon or increments thereof accrued, shall be known as the "State account."

FEDERAL ADVANCES TO BASIC RESERVE FUND

Sec. 205. (a) In the case of any State school building agency which has entered into an agreement as provided in this title with respect to an issue of obligations, the Commissioner shall advance to such State school building agency for deposit in the basic reserve fund for such issue an amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service of such obligations. Such advance shall be made on or before the date of delivery of any such obligations to the purchasers thereof. The advance so made, plus subsequent advances by the Commissioner, together with interest thereon or increments thereof accrued, shall be known as the "Federal account."

(b) If any funds are withdrawn in any year (other than the year in which occurs the latest maturity date of the obligations) from the Federal account in a basic reserve fund pursuant to an agreement under this title, the Commissioner shall make an additional advance to such account in an amount equal to that withdrawn.

(c) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all advances contracted to be made to the Federal account in a basic reserve fund pursuant to this title.

(d) Advances by the Commissioner to the Federal account in a basic reserve fund, together with any other sums in such account, shall be invested, as provided in the agreement—

(1) in interest-bearing securities of the United States or securities guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States, or

(2) in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

PAYMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL RESERVE FUND

Sec. 206. An agreement pursuant to this title shall provide for payment into the supplemental reserve fund established with respect to an issue of obligations of all sums collected for such purpose pursuant to section 209 (d) (2).

USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND BASIC RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 207. The agreement pursuant to this title shall provide that if the rentals and other funds available therefor for any year are, after payment of the other expenses specified in section 209 (d) (other than clause (1) thereof) with respect to which such rentals were collected, insufficient to meet the annual debt service for such year on any issue of obligations,

(a) the State school building agency shall use the sums, if any, in the supplemental reserve fund established for such issue for meeting such debt service;

(b) if such sums are insufficient for this purpose, such agency shall use the sums available in the basic reserve fund established for such issue;

(c) withdrawals from the basic reserve fund for this purpose shall be equally divided between the State account and the Federal account in the fund, to the extent the balance in the State account is adequate for this purpose; and

(d) if such balance is not adequate, the amount of any remaining deficiency shall be withdrawn from the Federal account to the extent of any balance therein, except that the total of the withdrawals from such account with respect to such debt service may not exceed one-half of such debt service.

REPAYMENTS OF ADVANCES

Sec. 208. An agreement under this title with respect to any issue of obligations shall provide that whenever the aggregate of the sums in the basic and supplemental reserve funds, including interest or other increments from the investment thereof, exceeds two times the maximum annual debt service on such issue for any of the ensuing years, the State school building agency shall pay to the Commissioner, first (and until all advances made by the Commissioner, subsequent to the original advance made by him, together with interest or other increment received from the investment of such advances, have been repaid), an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such excess as the sum of such subsequent advances bears to the sum of such advances plus the sum of any payments made by the State to the State account in the basic reserve fund in addition to the original amount of such State account; and second (and until all advances made by the Commissioner, together with interest or other increment received from the investment of such advances,

have been repaid), an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such excess as the sum of all advances made by the Commissioner bears to such sum plus the sum of all payments made to the State account. Amounts paid to the Commissioner under this section shall be used to redeem any outstanding obligations of the Commissioner issued pursuant to section 212 and any excess shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENT

SEC. 209. In addition to the foregoing provisions and such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as the Commissioner may deem necessary to provide reasonable assurance that advances by the Commissioner under this title will be repaid as provided in section 208, each agreement entered into by the Commissioner with respect to any one or more issues of obligations of a State school building agency shall provide—

(a) that (1) all such obligations shall mature in not more than 32 years from the earliest date of any of such obligations and the first payment of principal shall become due not later than the end of the third year following such earliest date, and (2) the proceeds of the sale of such obligations shall be used to finance the cost (including interest prior to, during, and for such period not exceeding 1 year after completion of construction as may be provided in the agreement, and other necessary carrying charges) of construction of school facilities, for rental by local educational agencies requesting such facilities;

(b) that such school facilities shall be limited to those certified by the State educational agency to be needed for current or reasonably anticipated enrollments and to be consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies, and that construction thereof will be in accord with applicable State construction laws and standards;

(c) that such school facilities, upon completion of construction, shall (1) be leased to the local educational agency for the school district in which the school facilities are located, (2) if the State so desires, be conveyed to such local educational agency upon the making of adequate provision for repayment of advances made by the Commissioner with respect to the issue of obligations and for retirement of such issue or an agreed upon portion thereof, as provided in the agreement; and

(d) that the rentals for such facilities shall be fixed, charged, and collected in amounts which will in the aggregate, together with other sums available for the purpose, provide sufficient funds to pay, to the extent payment is not otherwise provided for, (1) the annual debt service on the issue of obligations, and (2) in each year until the latest maturity date of such issue of obligations, for deposit in the supplemental reserve fund, an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 percent of the original principal amount of such issue of obligations, and (3) the cost of the maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance of such facilities, and administrative and other expenses of the State school building agency in connection with such facilities or the financing thereof.

AUTHORIZATION ON APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 210. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and the next 2 fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to provide the initial Federal advances authorized by this title to be made to basic reserve funds.

LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 211. The issues of obligations with respect to which Federal advances may be made pursuant to this title shall be limited to obligations issued in the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1958, in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $6 billion.

OBLIGATIONS ISSUED BY SECRETARY

SEC. 212. (a) To obtain funds for additional advances under section 205 (b), the Commissioner shall issue notes, debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The total amount of such obligations issued in any year may not exceed the aggregate amount needed for such additional advances for such year.

(b) Obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations hereunder. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made by State school building agencies hereunder, for payments on obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 213. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Commissioner by this title, the Commissioner, in addition to other powers conferred by this act, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements made under this title and to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title; except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney General in the conduct of litigation arising under this act.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 214. Any State school building agency with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title, or any holder of obligations with respect to which a reserve fund has been established under this title, may bring suit against the United States to enforce any duty of the Commissioner under this title or any undertaking of the Commissioner under an agreement under this title. In any action arising under this title to which the United States is a party, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amounts involved. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff, or any of the plaintiffs if there are more than one, resides or has his principal place of business or, if he does not have his principal place of business within any such judicial district, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS BY NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 215. The last sentence of paragraph seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 24), is amended by inserting "or State school building agency (but only in the case of obligations, of such an agency, with respect to which advances have been made pursuant to title II of the School Construction Act of 1955)" after "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and by striking out (in the proviso) "either of said banks" and inserting in lieu thereof "any of said banks or State school building agencies."

TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 216. Obligations of any State school building agency, including interest thereon, with respect to which advances are made pursuant to this title, and income of such agency in connection with the school facilities financed by such obligations, shall be exempt from all taxes (other than estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

TITLE III—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS ECONOMICALLY UNABLE TO FINANCE OR LEASE URGENTLY NEEDED SCHOOL FACILITIES

PURPOSE AND APPROPRIATION

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling local educational agencies to finance or lease urgently needed school facilities in cases where such agencies, because of lack of economic capacity, are unable—

(a) to sell their obligations to the Commissioner under title I, in the amounts needed to construct the facilities, or

(b) to rent such facilities from a State school building agency at rentals which the Commissioner determines to be comparable to those charged by State school building agencies pursuant to agreements with the Commissioner under title II,

there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and the next 2 fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $200 million, as the Congress may determine. Sums appropriated under this section for any year shall remain available for obligation until June 30, 1958.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot initially to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of all the States.

(2) At such time or times after December 31 of each fiscal year as the Commissioner determines, after receiving advice from the States with respect thereto, that the amounts (if any) to be paid to any State from its initial allotment for such year under this subsection will total less than such allotment, he shall reallot the portion of such initial allotment which he determines will not be so paid to such State. Such reallotments shall be made by the Commissioner to the States with respect to which he has not made the determination referred to in the preceding sentence for such year, on the same basis as the initial allotments for such year under paragraph (1).

(b) The sums allotted to a State for a fiscal year under subsection (a) shall be available (as provided hereinafter in this title) for paying the Federal share of payments by State educational agencies to assist in financing the cost of construction of school facilities for local educational agencies in the State.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 303. The Commissioner shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title if such plan—

(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan;

(b) sets forth standards and procedures, conforming to regulations of the Commissioner (prescribed after consultation with a

conference of representatives of State educational agencies), for determining eligibility of local educational agencies for payments under the plan and the amounts thereof, and the need for the facilities to be constructed, which standards and procedures provide reasonable assurance that

(1) such payments will be made only if, and to the extent, necessary to enable any local educational agency (A) to sell to the Commissioner, pursuant to title I, obligations in the amounts needed by such agency to construct the school facilities with respect to which the payments are made, or (B) if such agency is legally unable to sell such obligations, to rent such facilities from a State school-building agency at rentals which the Commissioner determines to be comparable to those charged by State school-building agencies pursuant to agreements with the Commissioner under title II; and

(2) such payments will be made only with respect to the construction of school facilities needed to relieve or prevent extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions;

(c) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan; and

(d) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for compliance with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 304. (a) In the case of each project for the construction of school facilities for a local educational agency with respect to which the State educational agency requests any funds under this title, the State educational agency shall include in its request—

(1) a description of the school-facilities project with respect to which the request is made;

(2) its estimate of the cost of construction of such project and a statement of the amount of the payment proposed to be made by the State educational agency with respect thereto under the plan.

(3) a certification that—

(A) it has determined, in accordance with the standards and procedures in the State plan, that the local educational agency is eligible for the payment proposed and that the school-facilities project is needed to relieve or prevent extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions;

(B) such local educational agency has requested the Commissioner to purchase, under title I, the Federal percentage of the obligations needed to finance the project and the Commissioner has denied such request because the agency is financially unable to repay the obligations or, if it is legally unable to sell such obligations, has requested a State school-building agency, which provides school facilities at rentals which the Commissioner determines to be comparable to those charged by State school-building agencies pursuant to agreements under title II, to provide such facilities and has had its request denied because it is financially unable to pay the rental for such facilities;

(C) State funds to cover the State share of such payment will be available.

(b) Each request for funds pursuant to subsection (a) shall be accompanied by a statement of the facts on which the State educational agency based its certification and its estimate of the cost of construction of the project, and such further information as the Commissioner may require for purposes of this title with respect to the school-facilities project involved.

(c) (1) The Commissioner, unless he finds that a payment under a State plan with respect to a school-facilities project for a local educational agency, for which a State has requested funds as provided in subsections (a) and (b), would not be in accord with the standards and procedures set forth in the State plan approved under section 303, shall reserve for such project a sum equal to the Federal share of such payment to the extent such sum is available in the State's allotment; and such sum shall remain available for payment to the State educational agency (unless the State withdraws its request) under paragraph (2) of this subsection until the end of the fiscal year following that in which such sum is so reserved.

(2) Upon certification by the State educational agency that—

(A) State funds equal to the State share of the payment with respect to such school-facilities project has been paid to or on behalf of the local educational agency, and

(B) the financing of the remainder of the cost of construction of such facilities has been arranged,

the Commissioner shall pay the State educational agency the Federal share of such payment.

(d) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent minus the "State share", and the State share shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that the State share shall in no case be more than 60 percent or less than 40 percent, and except that the State share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be 40 percent. Such Federal and State shares shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce, and the percentages so promulgated shall be conclusive for purposes of this title.

ABANDONMENT OF FACILITIES

SEC. 305. If the construction of any school facilities with respect to which funds have been paid to a State under this title is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, such State shall be obligated to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such funds or such lesser amount as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 306. (a) The Commissioner shall not make any payments under this title to assist in financing the construction of any school-facilities project, except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on such project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c).

TITLE IV—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PROGRAMS TO INCREASE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5 million each for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, $3 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and $2 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, for grants to States to assist them in meeting their administrative expenses in the development and initiation of State programs designed to increase public-school construction and promote efficiency in such construction.

ALLOTMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 402. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 401, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of the United States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $25,000 (or, in the case of Guam or the Virgin Islands, which is less than $12,500) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to such State 50 percent of the State's administrative expenses in the development of any State program for increasing construction of school facilities or promoting greater efficiency in planning or financing the construction of such facilities, or in the initiation of any such program when authorized by law, including the development and initiation of programs such as those to—

(1) extend State technical assistance to the local educational agencies in the planning and financing of construction of school facilities;

(2) extend State financial aid to local educational agencies, through loans, grants, or otherwise, in the construction of school facilities;

(3) adjust or modify unduly restrictive debt or tax limits or other obstacles to adequate and economical financing of construction of school facilities, including the basing of debt or tax limits on the full value of real property; or

(4) achieve a more efficient organization of school districts in the State.

(c) No payment may be made under this title with respect to any program unless the State plan approved under section 403 includes such program or has been modified to include it and unless the State educational agency certifies that it is a new program for the State (which, for purposes of this title, includes an addition to an existing program of the State). In the case of any program of the State (or any addition to a program) initiated after December 31, 1954, the continuation thereof shall be considered a new program for purposes of the preceding sentence if submitted under this title by the State prior to July 1, 1956.

(d) Payments under this section with respect to any program may be made during a period of not to exceed 3 years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made with respect to such program from an allotment under this section, but only if such program has been submitted under this title prior to July 1, 1958.

APPROVAL OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 403. The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this title if such plan—

(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for carrying out programs under the plan, either directly or through arrangements with other agencies of the State;

(b) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of programs under the plan;

(c) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for compliance with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(d) sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so.

METHOD OF MAKING AND COMPUTING PAYMENTS

SEC. 404. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to section 402 shall be as follows:

(a) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of such section for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Commissioner may find necessary.

(b) The Commissioner shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid the State for any prior period under such section was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such section. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

(c) Any funds paid to a State under this title which are not used for the purposes for which paid shall be returned to the Commissioner for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 501. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the officer or agency primarily responsible for State construction or supervision of construction of such schools, whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law.

(d) The term "State school building agency" means the single agency, official, governmental entity, or instrumentality of a State, designated or established by the State for purposes of title II.

(e) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State. If a separate public authority has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(f) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

(g) The term "debt service" means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest on and principal of each issue of obligations.

(h) The term "annual debt service" means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest on and principal of each issue of obligations becoming due in each successive 12-month period designated in accordance with the agreement under title II.

(i) The term "school facilities" includes classrooms and related facilities for public elementary and secondary education; initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or structures or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(j) The terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 502. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under section 303 or 403, as the case may be, has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of such section; or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement;

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 302 or 402, as the case may be, (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects or programs under the State plan affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under such section (or shall limit payments to projects or programs under the State plan in which there is no such failure). The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment or any amount reserved under section 304 (c) with respect to any school facilities project not affected by such failure; except that, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 304 (c) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

(b) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (a) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States.

(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 503. In administering the provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution concerned.

DELEGATION OF COMMISSIONER'S FUNCTIONS

SEC. 504. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

The summary presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSAL

The bill, in addition to a section containing the findings and declaration of purpose, has four substantive titles (there is a fifth title with definitions and miscellaneous provisions). All are designed to assist the States and local communities in increasing public-school construction.

Title I authorizes Federal purchases of part of the obligations of local educational agencies where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest.

Title II authorizes Federal support, with State participation, of obligations issued by State school building agencies established to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to and eventual ownership by local educational agencies.

Title III authorizes grants to States to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for either of the two forms of assistance described above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities.

Title IV authorizes grants to States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing State programs to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction and of initiating such programs when authorized by law.

The bill would be administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education.

TITLE I—FEDERAL PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MARGINAL CREDIT

Eligibility

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to purchase a part of the obligations issued by a local educational agency to finance the cost of constructing school facilities upon certification by the State educational agency that the local agency is unable, as evidenced by a public offering of its obligations for the purpose, to obtain financing from other sources at rates and

on terms comparable to those applicable to obligations purchased under this title.

Such purchase by the Commissioner would also be conditioned on certification by the State educational agency that the facilities to be constructed with the proceeds of the obligations are needed to meet current or future enrollments, are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans and policies and will be constructed in accordance with State construction laws and standards; and that, under the opinion of a qualified attorney, the bonds are legally issued and binding. The State educational agency would also be required to submit additional information to satisfy the Commissioner that the local educational agency is financially able to pay its obligations when due.

Appropriations

Appropriations aggregating $750 million would be authorized for the three fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

Amount of purchase

Not more than 15 percent of the amount appropriated for any year for purchases of obligations under the title would be available for purchase of the obligations of local educational agencies in any one State. The percentage of the cost of construction of any school facilities which could be covered by any such purchase would depend on the relative per capita income of the State. This percentage would vary between 50 and 80 percent; the percentage for the State with the national average per capita income would be 60 percent.

Interest, duration, and other attributes of obligations

Obligations could be purchased under this title during the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1958. The obligations could be any general or special obligations of the local educational agency. They would have to be purchased at par or face value, must be repaid within such period, not exceeding 30 years, as the Commissioner might determine, and would bear interest at the quarterly rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (on the basis of the rate for United States obligations with a maturity date of 15 or more years) to be applicable to the calendar quarter during which the obligations are purchased, plus one-half of 1 percent.

Administrative provisions

In addition to his other powers and duties, the Commissioner could sell or exchange the obligations purchased, could make adjustments in the obligations, and contracts with respect thereto, to protect the interest of the United States, could determine the character and necessity of expenditures, and would have to maintain a set of accounts, to be audited by the General Accounting Office, and a business-type budget.

TITLE II—FEDERAL CREDIT ASSISTANCE TO STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AGENCIES

Agreements with State school building agencies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into agreements with State school building agencies under which the State and the Commissioner would make advances to a State school building agency for establishment of reserve funds to help assure payment of obligations issued by such agency to finance the construction of schools for rental to local school districts. This agency could be a State school building agency or any other State agency, official, governmental entity, or instrumentality designated by the State and empowered to construct school facilities and otherwise carry out the provisions of an agreement entered into under this title. But there could be only one agency for a State for purposes of this title.

The agreement could be made with respect to any one or more issues of obligations and could be amended from time to time, as agreed upon by the State school building agency and the Commissioner.

Where the State school building agency is not the same as the State educational agency, the agreement would be conditioned upon certification by the Governor that methods of securing effective coordination between the two agencies had been provided.

Basic reserve fund

An amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on any issue of obligations under the agreement would be advanced by the State. A like amount would be advanced by the Federal Government. The amount advanced by the State would be known as the State account and that advanced by the Federal Government would be known as the Federal account. These two advances, plus interest and increments, would constitute the basic reserve fund.

Supplemental reserve fund

There would also be a supplemental reserve fund for each issue of obligations consisting of amounts deposited in such fund by the State school building agency out of rentals collected from the local educational agencies for which it provided school facilities. As indicated below, the rentals, in the aggregate, should be sufficient to cover, among other items, a deposit in this reserve of one-quarter of 1 percent of the original principal amount of any issue of obligations.

Combination of issues

At the option of the State school building agency, a single basic reserve, or a single such reserve and a single supplemental reserve, could be established for any two or more issues of obligations of the State agency. In that case, the agreement would provide the extent to which the combination of issues would be treated as a single issue.

Conditions of agreements

Under an agreement, all obligations in any issue for which a basic reserve fund is established would be required to mature in not more than 32 years from their earliest date, and the initial payment of principal would have to be due within 3 years from such date. The proceeds from the sale of the obligations could be available only for construction of school facilities for rental to local educational agencies requesting them.

The agreement would have to provide that the school facilities constructed would be certified by the State educational agency to be needed for current or anticipated school enrollments and to be consistent with applicable State redistricting plans and policies and in accord with State construction laws and standards.

The agreement would also have to provide for rentals which in the aggregate produced sufficient funds (together with other funds available) to pay, to the extent not otherwise provided for, the annual debt service, one-quarter of 1 per cent of the original principal amount of the issue of obligations (for payment into the supplemental reserve fund), the cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance, as well as the administrative and other expenses of the State school building agency.

Additional advances and use of reserve funds

If the rentals collected for any year by the State school building agency are insufficient to pay the items specified above with respect to any issue of obligations, the State school building agency would draw on the supplemental reserve to pay the portion of the annual debt service not covered by the rentals. After exhaustion of that reserve, the State and Federal accounts in the basic reserve fund would be equally available for payment of the annual debt service. If the State account were inadequate to bear its share of the unpaid annual debt service, the deficiency could be made up from the Federal account, to the extent of any balance therein. In the case of no year, however, could the Federal account be drawn upon for more than one-half of the annual debt service for that year.

After any withdrawals from the Federal account in the basic reserve fund for any year, the Commissioner would be obligated to restore the account to its original balance.

The State would also pay into the State account in any year the amount withdrawn for payment of the debt service for that year, but only to the extent of appropriations made available for the purpose.

Borrowing authority for additional Federal advances

The faith of the United States is pledged to the advances contracted by the Commissioner to be made under the title; and the Commissioner would be authorized to issue obligations to the extent necessary to make the additional advances. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to purchase such obligations. Obligations so issued would bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after considering the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States.

Repayments of Federal advances

Whenever the total of the sums in a supplemental reserve and a basic reserve fund, including interest and accruals, is more than twice the maximum annual debt service in any ensuing year on the issue of obligations involved, the excess would be required to be applied to repayments of the advances made by the Federal Government under this title. Repayments would first be made to the extent of any additional advances made by the Commissioner after the original advance to the basic reserve fund. These repayments would be made from the excess in the proportion that such additional advances bore to any additional advances made by the State to the State account in the basic reserve fund, after its original advance to that account.

After the subsequent advances of the Federal Government had been repaid, any excess over twice the maximum annual debt service for any ensuing year would be used to repay the Federal Government's original advance to the basic reserve fund in the proportion that the total of all advances by the Federal Government under the title bore to the total of all advances made by the State to the State account for the purpose of establishing and maintaining that account.

Repayments to the Federal Government as above provided would be used to retire any obligations issued under the Commissioner's authority to borrow funds, and any excess would be deposited in the Federal Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Duration of program

Appropriations would be authorized for the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 to cover the amount of the initial Federal advances to basic reserve funds. Such advances could be made only with respect to obligations issued during such 3 fiscal years. Obligations so issued, however, could (as indicated above) have maturities of up to 32 years after the earliest date of the obligations in the particular issue.

Total of obligations secured

Advances could be made by the Commissioner under this title for establishment of reserve funds to help assure payment of obligations in a principal amount aggregating up to $6 billion.

Investments by national banks

National banks would be permitted to deal in the obligations covered by agreements under the title and by reserve funds established pursuant thereto, to the extent that they would be lawful investments for such banks.

Administrative provisions

The Commissioner would be authorized to waive and compromise claims, and his financial transactions under the title would not be subject to review by any other governmental official.

Investment of funds in Federal account

Funds in the Federal account of basic reserve funds would have to be invested in United States securities, or United States guaranteed securities, or obligations which are lawful investments for public funds of the United States. The distribution as between these various types of interest-bearing securities and the maturities thereof, would be provided in the agreement.

Court action

Suits would be authorized in the district courts of the United States, by the State school-building agency or any bondholder to enforce any undertaking of the United States under the title.

Exemption from taxation

Obligations of State school building agencies covered by agreements made pursuant to this title, and the income of these agencies in connection with facilities financed therefrom, would be exempt from all Federal taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

TITLE III—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS ECONOMICALLY UNABLE TO FINANCE OR LEASE URGENTLY NEEDED SCHOOL FACILITIES

Appropriation

An aggregate amount of $200 million for the three fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 would be authorized to be appropriated for grants to States to cover the Federal share of payments by the State to local educational agencies, urgently in need of school facilities but unable to sell their obligations to the Commissioner of Education under title I because of their lack of economic capacity, or unable for the same reason to lease facilities to be built by State school building agencies which charge rentals comparable to those available under title II agreements.

Allotments

Initial allotments to the States of funds appropriated in any year under this title, would be made on the basis of their respectice school-age populations. After receiving advice from States indicating they would not use up their entire allotments, reallotments could be made by the Commissioner, from time to time between January 1 and June 30, among the other States on the same school-age population basis.

Allotments to the States would be available for paying the Federal share of payments by State educational agencies to assist in financing the cost of constructing school facilities for local educational agencies. The Federal share would be varied, on the basis of relative per capita income, between 40 percent and 60 per cent, with the Federal share for the State with the national average per capita income being 50 per cent.

State plans

State plans would be approved under this title if they (1) provided for administration by the State educational agency; (2) set forth standards and procedures, conforming to regulations of the Commissioner, providing reasonable assurance that payments to local educational agencies will be made (a) only if, and to the extent, necessary to enable the local agency to sell its obligations, to finance the remainder of construction costs, under title I of the bill or to arrange with a State school building agency (which charges rentals comparable to those charged under an agreement under title II of the bill) to build the building and lease it to the local agency, and (b) only with respect to school facilities needed to relieve or prevent extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions.

The plan would also have to provide for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures and for the making of necessary reports to the Secretary.

Payments from allotments

The State educational agency would have to file a request for Federal funds in connection with any school facilities project. The request would have to contain a certification by the State agency (1) that the local educational agency is eligible for the proposed payment (of Federal and State funds) under the standards and procedures in the State plan (relating to eligibility and amount of payment and need for facilities), (2) that because of its lack of economic capacity the Commissioner had refused the local agency's request to purchase part of its obligations for the needed facilities, or the State school building agency had refused it the rental of such facilities at rates comparable to those charged under the agreement, and (3) that State funds to cover the State share of the proposed payment to the local agency are available.

The Commissioner would reserve the Federal share of the proposed payment to the local educational agency unless he determines that the payment would not be in accord with the standards and procedures included in the State plan as to eligibility and amount of payment and need for facilities. The reservation would stand until the end of the succeeding year.

Payment of the Federal share of the State educational agency's payment to the local agency under the State plan would be made upon certification by the State agency that it had paid the State share to the local agency and that the rest of the financing of the cost of constructing the facilities had been arranged.

The State share would be varied among the States, on the basis of relative per capita income, between a minimum of 40 percent and a maximum of 60 percent, with the State share for the State with the national average per capita income being 50 percent. The Federal share would be the difference between the State share and 100 percent.

Abandonment of facilities

The Federal share (or lesser amount determined by the Commissioner) would have to be repaid to the United States if the construction of facilities with respect to which such share was paid is terminated, abandoned, or not completed within a reasonable time.

Labor standards

The Commissioner would not be able to extend any assistance under title I for financing the construction of school facilities except upon assurance that labor standards, relating to payment of prevailing wages and overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours per week or 8 hours per day, would be observed in such construction.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF STATE PROGRAMS TO INCREASE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation

Five million dollars each for the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958, $3 million for the fiscal year 1959, and $2 million for the fiscal year 1960 would be authorized to be appropriated under this title for grants to States to assist in meeting their administrative expenses in developing State programs designed to increase school construction, and in initiating such programs when authorized by law.

Allotments and payments

The appropriation for any year under this title would be allotted among the States on the basis of school-age population but with a minimum allotment of $25,000 ($12,500 for Guam and the Virgin Islands). Each State allotment would be available for paying half the cost of the State administrative expenses in the development of State programs for increasing construction of school facilities and promoting greater efficiency in planning or financing the construction of such facilities, or in the initiation of any such program when authorized by law.

Programs eligible

To be eligible for Federal support under this title, a program would have to be a new program, or an addition to an existing program, initiated after December 31, 1954, and submitted under this title prior to July 1, 1958 (prior to July 1, 1956, if initiated prior to enactment of the bill). The program would have to be included under a State plan approved by the Commissioner.

The types of programs, for the development or initiation of which grants under this title would be available, would include programs such as those extending technical or financial aid in planning or financing school construction and those to achieve more efficient school-district organization or to adjust or modify unduly restrictive tax or debt limits.

Duration of payments

Payments under this title could be made for only 3 years with respect to any one program.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

This title defines a number of terms used in the act. These terms are Commissioner, State, State educational agency, State school-building agency, local educational agency, school-age population, debt service, annual debt service, school facilities, and construct, constructing, and construction.

Withholding of funds and judicial review

Notice and hearing to the State educational agency would be required before grants to the State could be withheld under title III or IV for failure to comply with the required provisions of approved State plans under those titles. A State agency dissatisfied with such withholding action could obtain judicial review thereof in the Federal circuit courts of appeals.

Miscellaneous

The title also authorizes utilization of other agencies in the administration of the bill and delegation of the Commissioner of Education's functions under the bill to personnel of the Office of Education.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, President Eisenhower has presented an excellent program in his message and in the proposed legislation for Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public-school construction. I am very glad to join as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, which is based on a careful study of the needs throughout the country, providing effective Federal assistance, and recognizes that our public-school system must be founded on local control and responsibility.

It is in the field of construction of school facilities to meet expanding requirements that our school need is great, and it is in this field that the Federal Government can most effectively assist the States and local school districts.

The program proposes to provide substantial and effective assistance in four major phases:

Purchase by the Federal Government of obligations issued by local educational agencies to finance school construction, where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest.

Support by the Federal Government, with the participation of the States, of the obligations issued by State school-building agencies established to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to, and eventual ownership by, local educational agencies.

Federal grants to the States, to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for the assistance decribed above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities.

Federal grants to the States, to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction.

Many States, such as Minnesota, have in the past recognized the need for aid to distressed school districts which are unable to finance their school needs. Today, the problem is nationwide in scope, due to greatly increased enrollments and other factors. We must meet this problem if we are to maintain the standards of our public schools and meet the needs of our growing boys and girls. President Eisenhower's proposals are sound, and will command wide support.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT RELATIVE TO PROCESS OF SELECTION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to revive both the name and the process of selection under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, so that selection will be retained as a part of the purposes of that act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 969) to amend the Universal Military Training Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESIDENCE FOR CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

If enacted, this bill would create a Capitol Pages' Residence Board composed of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives who would be authorized to establish a home for the young men who serve here as pages. I feel sure that every Member of the Senate realizes the need for such a home and the need for adult supervision in this home. Under the present setup, the pages have living quarters scattered over the city. Not only are some of these young men paying exhorbitant rents, but they are in many cases exposed to the evils of a large city. We in the Congress have appointed these young men to leave their homes and travel to this city and live here many months of each year. We should feel a bit of responsibility toward them and their families back home. I feel that it is our duty and moral obligation to establish such a residence board which would in turn acquire a home near the Capitol in which the pages would live under adult supervision. My proposal would require that the pages pay rent as they now do; therefore, the home would be self sustaining. I am sure that the parents of the pages would thank the United States Congress for legislation of this kind.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will consider favorably this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 973) to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The bill requires that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity on a permanent basis.

I introduce the bill because I am deeply interested in the welfare of our farmers, who form a vital part of our economy. If we are to remain economically strong, the farmers must have some assurance of a fair return from their labor; and they should have this assurance on a permanent, rather than a temporary year-to-year basis.

I wish to call attention briefly to figures cited in a recent issue of U. S. News & World Report. They show that farmowners have had the lowest buying power of 12 wage-earning groups in 1950 and 1954. The same is expected to be true again this year.

Figures released by the United States Department of Agriculture demonstrate another point I wish to make, namely, as compared with the official 1910–14 base, from which the parity formula is derived, prices received by farmers now stand at only 239 percent, while they are forced to pay 279 percent for production costs.

In addition, while the overall farm parity ratio on December 15, 1953, was 91 percent, by December 15, 1954, it had dropped to 86 percent.

Mr. President, I believe it is time that we give to the farmers of the Nation economic justice, not only for the sake of our hard-working farm population, but also as a stabilizing influence for our national economy in these uncertain times.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PUNISHMENT FOR CERTAIN CONFIDENCE GAME SWINDLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from the Department of Justice a draft bill to provide punishment for utilization of interstate commerce in the perpetration of confidence game swindles.

I believe that this proposed legislation is necessary in the public interest, in view of the increasing amount of such swindles perpetrated on the innocent public.

This bill has previously passed the Senate, and I hope that in this Congress it will not only be quickly approved by the Senate, but will be promptly enacted by the House of Representatives as well.

I send to the desk a letter from Attorney General Brownell asking enactment of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and thereafter be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 997) to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles, introduced by Mr. Wiley, was received, read twice by its titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JANUARY 31, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of Justice recommends enactment of legislation to provide punishment for the utilization of interstate commerce in the perpetration of confidence game swindles and a draft of a bill to carry out such recommendation is attached for your consideration and appropriate action.

Existing law provides punishment, in section 2314, title 18, United States Code, for the transportation in interstate commerce of goods, wares, merchandising, securities or money, of the value of $5,000 or more, knowing the same to have been stolen, converted, or taken by fraud. This section also includes other paragraphs providing punishment for transportation in interstate commerce of certain articles used in counterfeiting. The statute, however, fails to afford means to prosecute for interstate transportation of persons in the perpetration of confidence games.

One of the more extensive activities of the confidence man is often directed toward retired businessmen and their families or individuals of some prominence in the community who are reluctant to report their gullibility. This reluctance on the part of the victim, together with the element of the scheme set up by the confidence man to lead the victim to believe that his money will be returned, causes a delay in the reporting

of the violation to the authorities. This delay permits the confidence man to move to another section of the country, dispose of the money or property taken from the victim, and thus destroy the necessary evidence to establish certain elements of the crime.

In many of the major confidence swindles perpetrated by professional confidence men the victims are located when they are away from home. After inducing the victim to participate in some false stock market or race track transaction, the confidence man induces the victim to return to his home, obtain the necessary money and return to the scene of the swindle where the money is turned over to the operator. After the money has been turned over to the confidence man, the victim is instructed to go to another city where he is to receive the return on his "investment." Such moving of the victim is a part of the scheme and gives the confidence man time in which to dispose of the money or property taken in the swindle and to flee to a distant "cool-off" spot.

Section 2314 of title 18 may be appropriately amended by the insertion of a new paragraph to supply the needed means to punish the perpetrators of this type of swindle.

This legislation in the identical form here suggested was introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives in the 83d Congress as S. 3441 and H. R. 8914. S. 3441 was passed by the Senate on August 11, 1954, and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary on August 16, 1954.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

POLICY CONCERNING THE TERMINATION, LIMITATION, OR ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1003) to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes the declaration of a national policy against the Government's encroachment into fields of commerce, industry, and finance in competition with its own taxpaying citizens.

It has been a matter of common knowledge for many years that Government has engaged in, and should continue to do so, certain activities that are broadly classified as business—for example—the operation of the post office; the manufacture of various essential items by the navy yards, ordnance, and quartermaster branches of the armed services; the production of electric power at TVA.

It becomes a matter of serious congressional concern, however, when studies by the Committee on Government Operations and other committees of the Congress develop the fact that more than 100 commercial activities are being carried on by various Federal departments and agencies. After the approval of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Senate Committee on Government Operations devoted much time and study to the development of programs designed to eliminate Government competition with private industry. Various other committees of the House and the Senate have conducted similar studies, and have advanced proposals with the objective of taking the Government out of business and encouraging private enterprise to provide necessary services to the Government.

One of the most important steps taken by the committee toward attaining this objective was the approval of legislation creating the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The Commission was directed to make studies and submit recommendations to the Congress with the objective of "eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise." The Commission's task forces recently reported, unofficially, that there are many Government businesses that are questionable as to necessity and value. The Commission will shortly present its recommendations, including certain legislative proposals to do away with Government's improper competition in business.

In the meantime, it is timely that the Congress go on record in favor of a definite policy of noncompetition with private industry in the production of goods and the securing of necessary services by the Government where such action is not inconsistent with the national interest and security, as proposed by the subject bill.

The time has come, that the Congress should give assurance to taxpaying businesses that once the present situation has been corrected it will not be permitted to grow up again. With this objective in mind, the bill I am introducing today includes, in addition to section 2, which sets forth a broad statement of national policy, two other exceedingly important sections.

One of these—and I believe it to be of the utmost importance in whatever legislation the Congress may adopt—seeks to establish what might be called a court of complaint to which businessmen, especially small businessmen, may seek relief through the presentation of their grievances whenever they feel that they are being unduly and unnecessarily discriminated against by competitive Government business. The responsibility for administering this provision would be vested in the Department of Commerce, because it is more deeply concerned with business than any other agency of Government. No such court of complaint now exists. I believe that it is most desirable that it be established.

The other special feature of the proposed legislation is the declaration that any new competitive business-type operation which any department or agency plans to initiate must be reviewed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget before the expenditure of any appropriation therefor is permitted. This objective is based on the premise that too many of the existing commercial and industrial activities of Government have been quietly put into operation before even the head of the department or agency knew about them—and once started they are exceedingly difficult to stop. Under my proposal many of them would never get started.

Approval of the bill I am introducing today would indicate the support of the legislative branch of the program initiated by the Executive Office of the President on January 15, 1955 (Bulletin No. 55-4), which expanded the review of commercial and industrial activities under the direction of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to determine the number and character of commercial and industrial-type activities now being conducted by the Government. This directive also requires that agencies engaged in such activities shall consider the pertinent legal authorization for the activities which are in competition with private enterprise and seek congressional approval when necessary to permit continuation of such activities.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH PURPOSES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

On behalf of myself and 21 other Senators, I am introducing for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section

203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide that no surplus Federal property, including property capitalized in a working-capital fund, shall be sold until it has been determined whether or not such property is usable and necessary for educational or public-health purposes, including research.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 included an amendment which I sponsored, authorizing the donation of surplus real and personal property to State departments of education and health, and to research institutions. Under this authority, surplus Federal property which was urgently needed by these institutions has been made available to them without cost.

On February 1, 1954, however, the Department of Defense issued a directive which provided that, when working-capital funds are established and property is taken up in such accounts, surplus property would no longer be donated for these public purposes, but could be sold to replenish the working-capital account. Since this directive became effective, the amount of surplus property generated by the Defense Establishment which is usable for education or public-health purposes has decreased substantially. The purpose of this bill is to reestablish the authority which existed prior to the date of this directive, in order that educational and health institutions may continue to obtain surplus Federal property which is essential to their needs, in the same manner as they did prior to February 1, 1954.

Since 1949, the State surplus property offices have performed a considerable amount of paperwork entailed in screening and channeling surplus property into the State agencies on a mutual-agreement basis. The utilization of local personnel and offices for screening and allocating surplus property has enabled the State and local agencies to acquire the property more expeditiously, and has permitted the Federal Government to save on manpower and appropriations. In order to give legal authority to these mutual arrangements, the bill contains a provision for the establishment of cooperative agreements between the Federal Government and State departments of education or health which are responsible for carrying out the surplus property utilization program.

This bill further provides for clarifying the authority for placing restrictions and limitations on the allocation and use of surplus property allocated to State agencies. Under existing law, the Federal Government has placed certain restrictions on the transfer of both real and personal property. There is some doubt as to whether the Congress intended that these limitations should be imposed, at least to the extent they have been applied, with reference to the utilization of personal property. Under the bill which I have introduced, this provision would be clarified in order that the required restrictions and limitations will apply only to real property, and that all of the restrictions heretofore placed on the utilization of personal property under the donation program would cease to exist 1 year after the effective date of this act.

The passage of this bill will not only improve the surplus property utilization program, but should effect considerable economy and efficiency in its administration.

An identical bill, H. R. 3322, was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 31, 1955, by Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

REDUCTION OF VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, President Eisenhower, at various times, has recommended that 18-year-old citizens be allowed to vote. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to set some policy guideposts for wise use of America's abundance.

Many of us who have actively supported effective farm programs for stability in agriculture and decent standards of farm living have long been equally concerned with the wise use of the abundance America's farmers are capable of producing. A few weeks ago I introduced with a group of colleagues Senate Joint Resolution 20, the family farmers bill of rights resolution, setting forth policy objectives for agricultural legislation itself. I regard this as a necessary companion joint resolution, aimed at the broad interest of farmers and consumers alike in seeing that good use is made of our abundance.

The great productive ability of American famers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people. That is our purpose in asking for a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards, and buttress the foreign policy of the United States. It can well serve as a yardstick by which to measure future legislation aimed at achieving objectives laid down in the policy resolution.

The new joint resolution declares it to be the policy of the Congress that:

First. The means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and clothing for an adequate standard will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

Second. The food and fiber products on American farms and not needed for fully adequate domestic consumption will be put to work to implement United States foreign policy through facilitating—

(a) The inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them;

(b) More rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations;

(c) The elimination of the threat of starvation and famine; and

(d) increases in the security and income earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations.

Third. Adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and of food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

Fourth. Extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

Fifth. American farm families will be assured of adequate income to maintain a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupations, while maintaining full production on the family farms of the Nation, conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources, and meeting all costs of production and capital replacement.

The joint resolution calls upon the President to incorporate in the economic report required by the Employment Act of 1946 an appraisal of whether or not existing legislation is serving these objectives adequately, and a program for carrying out the policy together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or advisable in connection with the program.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "National Food and Fiber Policy Joint Resolution."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(a) Food and clothing supplies per person in many families in the United States and in many areas of the world are far below the minimum required for healthful and productive living.

(b) The basic adequate food allotment for the average individual, with appropriate adjustments for eating habits and climate, consists of the following amounts of food per week or the equivalent thereof in other foods as determined by scientific nutrition and dietetic research:

(1) milk, and its equivalent in cheese, evaporated milk, or dry milk, 5¼ quarts,

(2) potatoes and sweetpotatoes, 3 pounds, 7 ounces,

(3) dry beans, peas, and nuts, 8 ounces,

(4) tomatoes and citrus fruits, 1 pound, 10 ounces,

(5) green or yellow vegetables, such as green cabbage, kale, snap beans, and carrots, 1 pound, 9 ounces,

(6) other vegetables and fruits, 2 pounds, 6 ounces,

(7) eggs, 4,

(8) meat, poultry, and fish, 1 pound, 12 ounces,

(9) flour and cereals, 4 pounds, 4 ounces (enriched or whole grain),

(10) fats and oils, 14 ounces, and

(11) sugars, sirups, and preserves, 11 ounces.

(c) Failure of food supplies to attain this basic adequate allotment, and of fiber supplies to attain equivalent standards for clothing, undermines the maintenance of health, efficiency, and morale of the American people and the people of friendly nations.

(d) Supplies of food and fiber available from time to time should be efficiently distributed among the various sections of this Nation and friendly nations among persons in all income groups.

(e) The assurance of adequate food and clothing supplies would be an important step toward strengthening democracy throughout the world and creating the economic foundations and atmosphere of hope and confidence necessary for world peace.

(f) The development of more adequate reserves of farm products would provide essential safeguards against shortages resulting from natural causes such as drought, flood, and pestilence; from breakdowns in distribution; and from inflation, insurrection, and war.

(g) It is essential to the national security and the general welfare that production and consumption of farm products be maintained at a high level in the United States as a means of maintaining a healthy population and a strong, productive economy, and to buttress the Nation's foreign policy.

(h) In many friendly nations more rapid economic development is blocked by lack of universal general and technical education and facilities resulting from the inability of parents of farm children to release them from day-to-day labor in food and fiber production; United States farm products could be used to break the poverty cycle in these nations by supplying food and clothing for children and adults attending and teaching schools.

(i) Both the foreign and domestic markets for American farm products have historically been characterized by fluctuations and recurrent depressions.

(j) The maintenance of a healthy and prosperous agriculture on the family-farm pattern is essential to the preservation and improvement of democracy in America.

(k) The prices and income received by American farm families have been declining and threaten to decline still further; each such decline bring with it the threat of reduced farm purchasing power and purchases, reduced demand for industrial products used on the farm and by farm families, and a resulting enforced reduction of industrial employment.

(l) American farms and farm families are fully capable of producing efficiently a greater abundance of food and fiber products, while at the same time conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources.

(m) This great productive ability of American farmers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is the policy of Congress that the United States should take appropriate action to insure that—

(a) the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and sufficient clothing for an adequate standard of clothing will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

(b) the food and fiber products produced on American farms and not needed for fully adequate domestic consumption will be put to work to implement United States foreign policy through facilitating (1) the inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them, (2) more rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations, (3) the elimination of the threat of starvation and famine, and (4) increases in the security and income-earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations;

(c) adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and of food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

(d) extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

(e) American farm families will be assured of adequate income to maintain a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupations, while maintaining full production on the family farms of the Nation, conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources, and meeting all costs of reproduction and capital replacement.

PROGRAM TO BE INCLUDED IN ECONOMIC REPORT

SEC. 4. The President shall incorporate in the economic report required by the Employment Act of 1946 a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 3 of this joint resolution, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or advisable in connection with the program.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by Senator KNOWLAND before the Montgomery County, Md., Republican organization on February 2, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Some Lessons of Our International Experience," delivered by him on February 3, 1955, before the Dayton, Ohio, Council of World Affairs, at Dayton, Ohio.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "Progress in Reverse," prepared by him for delivery before the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association, New York, January 26, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF TREVOR GARDNER TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the RECORD will show that the nomination of Mr. Trevor Gardner to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on February 4, 1955.

The committee rules require that nominations lie over a specified period of time before they may be considered. The purpose of this delay is to make it possible for the Members of the Senate, as well as the general public, to be apprised of the fact that consideration of the nomination will be forthcoming.

I have risen at this time, Mr. President, to state that the Committee on Armed Services will hold a public hearing on this nomination on Thursday, February 17 at 10:30 a. m. in room 212, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Robert H. Jackson, deceased.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the above nomination. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. It is requested that such persons notify the committee on or before February 19, 1955, whether they will be present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JULIUS C. HOLMES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson. I give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, for the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Yalta Agreement, I have prepared a statement which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

A decade has now passed since the signing of the infamous Yalta Agreement, a decade which has been a tragic reminder of betrayal of national honor. The sacrifice of long-standing friends, which was agreed to by our representatives at the Yalta Conference, remains a dark chapter in the history of American foreign policy.

The American people have never sanctioned this agreement nor has it ever been approved by either House of the Congress. In the face of repeated violations by the Soviets, who have used this agreement as another device to further their imperialistic designs, it is a sham and a delusion to perpetuate the hoax of its validity.

To the brave people of Poland, who have borne the suffering and the persecution resulting from this sellout, I join in reaffirming our traditional friendship and in voicing our sincere hope for speedy liberation. Let us never waver in our firm obligation to correct the injustice committed on that infamous day 10 years ago.

On this anniversary let us renew a firm determination to right the horrible injustice perpetrated in the name of our Government.

EFFECT OF YALTA AGREEMENT ON POLAND—LETTER FROM POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me from the Polish-American Congress, Inc., dated January 25, 1955. The letter calls attention to the fact that February 7, 1955, which was yesterday, when the Senate was not in session, marked the 10th anniversary of the famous wartime meeting of the Big Three at Yalta which resulted unhappily, among other things, in shutting Poland off behind the Iron Curtain, and the enslavement of the wonderful people of Poland.

We in Connecticut have a special feeling in regard to that situation, because a very high percentage of the people who live in our State came there from Poland. There are in Connecticut first, second, and third generation Poles by the thousands. I could not let this anniversary pass without paying tribute to those people and their relatives, those oppressed people who unhappily were placed behind the Iron Curtain largely as the result of the agreements reached at Yalta.

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

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C. January 25, 1955.

The Honorable PRESCOTT S. BUSH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: We are taking the liberty of bringing to your attention that February 7, 1955, will mark the 10th anniversary of that famous wartime meeting of the "Big Three" which marked the beginning of a series of retreats of the free world before the forward march of Soviet aggression.

We refer, of course, to the meeting of Joseph V. Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston S. Churchill at Yalta, in 1945.

Under an agreement reached there—or, rather extracted by Stalin under the threat not to join in the war with Japan—the Soviet sphere of influence has been carved out in Eastern Europe. The enslavement of several European nations, Poland included, has been sanctioned by the two western leaders, caving in under Stalin's blackmail.

At Yalta, too—the way was paved for the Sovietization of China.

The Yalta compact remains an executive agreement, never ratified by the United States Senate and therefore not binding. Repeated Soviet violations of the Yalta agreement deprive that document, secretly drafted, of its last vestige of questionable validity.

Millions of Americans believe that the Yalta agreement should be denounced and declared not valid. All unilateral actions undertaken by Stalin under the cloak of that most unfortunate result of personal diplomacy, should be declared illegal.

Only a complete and unhesitating renunciation of the Yalta agreement by the Congress and the executive branch of our Government could restore American prestige in Europe and Asia.

Referring to your splendid record in the fight for American security and our moral leadership of the free world, we beg to submit to your attention the necessity of raising your voice on the floor of the Senate on Monday, February 7, in defense of the Polish nation—the prime victim of the Yalta deal—and the other nations, victimized by Soviet imperialism.

You may rest assured that the expression of your views on that occasion will find most appreciative response in the minds and hearts of those who deeply believe that as long as Yalta remains unrepudiated and undenounced, the enslaved nations of the world—our most faithful allies—will be unable to trust our word.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish-American Congress, Inc.

TARIFF REVISION—THE PAYCHECK PERIL POINT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on Monday, January 24, 1955, I referred in a brief address on the Senate floor to a letter addressed by me to Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, in which I urged that constant thought be given to the paycheck peril point during the forthcoming tariff negotiations at Geneva, Switzerland.

I have now received his reply, and I am pleased to observe that Mr. Waugh shares my concern over this problem, and my belief that improvement of the paycheck reflected in higher real wages and improved living standards is one of the basic objectives of the President's foreign trade program.

Enclosed with my letter to Mr. Waugh was an exhibit showing comparative wage rates in the rubber footwear industry in Hong Kong and in Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley. An example of the wage differentials in this exhibit is the rate paid to male packers—8 cents an hour in Hong Kong; $2.05 in Naugatuck.

In addition to the rubber footwear industry, other Connecticut industries may be vulnerable to unfair competition based on such a startling disparity in the wages paid here and abroad. Among them are the hat industry in Danbury and Norwalk, the bicycle industry in Torrington, the manufacture of vacuum bottles in Norwich and New Britain, our clock and watch and textile industries, and the flashlight industry in Bridgeport and New Haven.

Mr. Waugh quite properly points out that a wage advantage may be offset by other factors. As I said in my statement on January 24, in some cases the lower wage rates paid abroad may be offset by the greater skill and productivity of American workers, and by the superiority of our production methods. I repeat, however, that it is impossible to believe that such factors can close a gap so great as that between the starvation levels prevailing in Hong Kong and the wage standards which our Connecticut workers earn and deserve.

I am pleased by Mr. Waugh's statement that my letter and the wage differentials exhibit will be brought to the attention of the agencies participating in the deliberations of the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee. If the paycheck peril point is kept constantly in mind by these agencies, it will serve as a danger signal against indiscriminate and injudicious reductions in tariffs.

Mr. Waugh also points out that Connecticut has a very considerable stake in expansion of exports, referring to a study made a few years ago by the Connecticut Development Commission, in which 552 Connecticut manufacturers reported that they exported goods valued at $144,526,000 in 1947 and at $139,899,000 in 1948.

These figures, reflecting only direct exports and not including products manufactured in Connecticut which go into the production of export goods, tend to support the estimate of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston that approximately 10 percent or more of our employment in Connecticut is dependent on exports.

Mr. Waugh's letter confirms my conviction that the administration intends to proceed carefully in carrying out the President's foreign trade program. By faithfully observing the principles of gradualness, selectivity, and reciprocity insisted upon by Mr. Eisenhower, we can achieve a result beneficial to Connecticut's economy as well as the economies of other highly industrialized areas of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Waugh's letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 4, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: I have examined with interest the exhibit attached to your letter of January 21 showing comparative wage rates in the rubber footwear industry in Hong Kong and in the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut. The disparity in wage rates between rubber footwear workers in Hong Kong and in Connecticut seems startling when so dramatically presented. Yet a wage advantage of itself does not necessarily determine the competitive position of the foreign producer in view of the greater productivity of United States workers, the greater mechanization of United States industry, the more advanced technical know-how and managerial skills and other important advantages which American workers and American manufacturers have in their favor.

I certainly agree that we must be concerned with what you refer to as the paycheck peril point. In fact—quite aside from the additional urgency which our national security gives to the President's foreign trade program—the improvement of the paycheck reflected in higher real wages and improved living standards is one of the basic objectives of that program.

I am having copies of your letter and of the data contained in the United States Rubber Co.'s booklet distributed to the various agencies participating in the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee.

The committee, before making a recommendation as to a possible tariff concession on any product, takes into careful consideration all available information and views applicable to that product. As you know, one of its constant guides is the avoidance of recommendations for tariff concessions which would cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic industry. The committee also has been directed by the President to make sure that none of the products on which concessions are recommended are made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country which is the principal supplier. In fact the trade-agreements legislation itself and the procedures established under it contain safeguards against hardship which all of us realize would be a regrettable disservice to the Naugatuck Valley and to the country as a whole.

It would be equally regrettable, on the other hand, to ignore the interest of the Nation as a whole or of its component areas in the expansion of world trade on a mutually profitable basis. For example, the position of the State of Connecticut as an exporter of a wide variety of products is clearly an important factor in its continuing prosperity. According to a survey made a few years ago by the Connecticut Development Commission, 552 Connecticut manufacturers reported that they exported goods valued at $144,526,000 in 1947 and at $139,899,000 in 1948. These figures represent only the direct exports of Connecticut products in those years and do not include products manufactured in Connecticut which go into the production of export goods. The Commission pointed out as an example the use of ball bearings made in Connecticut in motor vehicles exported from the United States. Those same motor vehicles may well be equipped with tires made in Connecticut plants or in United States Rubber Co. plants in other States paying the high wages which are characteristic of American industry.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL C. WAUGH,
Assistant Secretary.

THE ETHICS OF THE FOURTH ESTATE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 22, 1955, the North Carolina Press Association unanimously adopted a truly magnificent statement of the ethical principles which ought to guide those who gather, publish, and comment upon the news. The statement was prepared by a committee the chairman of which was one of North Carolina's ablest newspapermen of all time, Mr. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, who was assisted by the following outstanding associates: Mr. Frank A. Daniels, of the News and Observer, Raleigh; Mr. Al G. Dickson, of the Wilmington Star-News, Wilmington; Mr. Rupert Gillett, of the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte; Mr. Weiman Jones, of the Franklin Press, Franklin; Mr. Thomas J. Lassiter of the Smithfield Herald, Smithfield; Mr. C. A. (Pete) McKnight, of the Charlotte News, Charlotte; Mr. Lynn Nisbet, of the Associated Afternoon Dailies, Raleigh; Mr. Roy Parker, Sr., of the Hertford County Herald, Ahoskie; Mr. E. A. Resch, of the Chatham News, Siler City; Mr. Thomas J. Shaw, of the Thomasville Tribune, Thomasville; Mr. David J. Wichard, of the Greenville Reflector, Greenville; Mr. William J. Woestendiek, of the Journal and Sentinel, Winston-Salem; Mr. Clarence Whitefield, of the Durham Herald-Sun, Durham; and Mr. Miles H. Wolff, of the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro.

Since this statement of ethical principles is worthy of full commendation and acceptance, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE

The newspapers of North Carolina, conscious of their obligations, and mindful of their own human imperfections, rededicate themselves to these principles which guide a responsible press in a free society.

I

Freedom of the press exists in a democracy, not for the power or profit or pleasure of any individual, but for the common good. The right of the people to know cannot be denied or diminished without endangering democracy itself. It is the obligation of the press to provide accurate, timely, and complete information about all developments which affect the people's political, economic, or social well-being. Given the facts, the people usually will reach wise decisions.

II

The trusteeship of a free press is the final responsibility of the publisher. He may share it, but he cannot escape it. The good publisher provides the necessary money and space for adequate coverage of the essential news and employs personnel of integrity, ability, and sound judgment. He exalts accuracy above every other consideration, and insists upon prompt, full, and even generous correction when errors occur.

III

Every citizen deserves the stimulus of a strong editorial page, on which the editor voices his own well-informed opinion, clearly and forcefully; yet willingly provides space for contrary opinion. The good editor often takes sides, but without arrogance or intolerance. He champions boldly the rights of the people, sometimes against government itself. He provides leadership, particularly in his own community. He has a special responsibility to defend the weak, to prod the public conscience, and to speak out against the injustices of which a majority can sometimes be guilty.

IV

The primary function of a newspaper is to report the news. The good reporter strives constantly to find and write the truth. This task, no matter how difficult, is his unescapable responsibility.

To be true, a story, together with its headlines, must be honest. To be honest, it must be fair. To be fair, it must be accurate and complete.

Honesty demands objectivity, the submergence of prejudice and personal conviction. Fairness demands regard for the rights of others. Accuracy demands courage, painstaking care, and perspective to assure a total picture as true as its individual facts.

V

The final test of every story, every headline, every editorial, every newspaper is:

Is it honest?

Is it fair?

Is it accurate?

To the end that they can more frequently answer these questions in the affirmative, the newspapers of North Carolina adopt this statement of principle.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement with regard to the letter sent by President Eisenhower yesterday to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board with regard to Northwest Airlines service to Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be followed by the text of the President's letter and the text of a telegram from the Milwaukee Association of Commerce regarding the still pending issue of the vital direct inner great circle route to Alaska.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S LETTER ON HAWAII SERVICE WELCOME

The State of Wisconsin is gratified at the decision of President Eisenhower represented in his letter of February 7 to the Honorable Chan Gurney, Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The President's letter, which is admittedly of a compromise nature, certifies both Northwest Airlines and Pan-American World Airways to continue to operate the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route for a temporary period of 3 years.

I want to say in all frankness that if Northwest had been denied the opportunity to continue the route to Hawaii, which it pioneered, the entire area of our Nation which this great airline has served so long and so well would have been deeply disturbed.

For some months, I have taken up this problem and the matter—already decided—of Northwest service to Tokyo, with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Immediately upon learning of the order which would have canceled Northwest's right to Hawaii, I conveyed my respectful communication of protest to the White House.

In all fairness to our great Chief Executive, let it be stated that this is but one of a thousand problems which he faces and which his staff faces. With all the heavy problems pressing down upon them—at home and abroad—it is understandable why now and then some decision may be reached which may not be, in the judgment of many folks, all that it should be.

In this instance, I respectfully disagreed with the President and so stated to his staff.

While the letter of February 7 does not represent a perfect and permanent solution to the present problem, at least it goes a long way toward relieving the concern in the minds of many people.

We of Wisconsin—particularly in Milwaukee and Madison—have a vital stake in the continuation of Northwest Airlines' great service. Innumerable business enterprises throughout my State depend crucially upon this great transportation artery. Its severance would have been a heavy blow to us and to our neighbor States as well.

Now I intend to continue to keep in close touch with the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board on this situation and in particular on the decision on Northwest's vital service to Anchorage via Edmonton, Alberta. This later route is an indispensable commercial artery for my State and many others. A favorable decision is therefore essential. Wisconsin respectfully urges a "green light" for this Northwest Airlines route.

LETTER OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO CHAN GURNEY, CHAIRMAN OF CAB, RELEASED FEBRUARY 7, 1955, AT WHITE HOUSE

DEAR MR. GURNEY: I desire to amend my letter of February 1, with reference to the west coast Hawaii case.

As you know, I believe in the strength of competitive enterprise if based on sound economic considerations, but it must not be wasteful duplication at the expense of the

Federal Government. Both carriers operating on this Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route have built up substantial business. Moreover, since my original action in this case, I have received from you information to the effect that within 2 years all airlines subsidies in the Pacific area will probably have been eliminated or will at least approach that point. Renewing the certificates of both carriers for a limited period would afford them an equal opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to develop adequate traffic to operate without subsidies or to prove definitely that the route cannot economically support two carriers.

Accordingly, I request the Board present for my approval a revised order in this case which would certify both Northwest Airlines and Pan-American World Airways for operation between Seattle-Portland and Hawaii for a temporary period of 3 years from now.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 8, 1955.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Milwaukee business highly pleased with President's decision to reverse his previous order and to authorize CAB to issue a 3-year extension to Northwest Airlines for continuation of profitable route from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii. We sincerely appreciate your effective action in this respect.

However, we are sorely disappointed that the President's latest action did not include reversal of his previous decision to eliminate the direct inner great circle route from Milwaukee to Alaska. We earnestly believe this route is basic to Wisconsin's future growth in domestic trade with Edmonton, Canada, and Anchorage, Alaska, as well as our foreign trade with the Orient. This is the most direct route of any American carrier to Japan, the Philippines, and to the cold war areas of the Far East, hence should be developed commercially in the interests of national defense.

We sincerely trust that you can prevail upon the President to retain this direct route from important industrial areas of the Midwest to the Orient.

WILLIAM A. MANN,
President, Milwaukee Association of Commerce.
AUGUST K. PAESCHKE,
Chairman, Air Service Division.

PROPOSED REFORMS IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the need for a nationwide primary and reforms in the electoral college.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

We have recently heard a great deal about the need for reforms in the electoral college, which has the responsibility each 4 years of formalizing the election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

I am among those who believe that this archaic institution should be reformed, if not abolished altogether, if we are to maintain democratic realism in the conduct of our elections, and hence insure that the operation of government will continue responsive to the people.

However, Mr. President, I think that our need for reform goes far beyond any indicated changes in the process of the electoral college. I have been convinced for some time that if our free government by the people is to continue, and if the convictions of the individual private citizen are to count, there must be improvement in the means by which the nominees of the various parties who contest any of these elections gain their places on the ticket.

One of the first legislative proposals which I submitted to Congress when I came to the House some 9 years ago called for a national system of primaries. I now have pending before the Senate such a proposal.

I do not claim to be the author of the idea for a system of a nationwide nominating primary. To my knowledge, it first was advocated 42 years ago in 1913 by President Woodrow Wilson in his first annual message to the Congress. Various Members of the Senate have urged the national primary idea since that time, and there are in the Senate a number of Senators who, like me, earnestly believe that the primary system of naming a Presidential candidate is a most desired extension of the democratic process.

Mr. President, there is a demand on the part of the people throughout the Nation for a voice in the naming of Presidential candidates. Even prior to the 1952 conventions, the report of a survey of public opinion by Dr. George Gallup indicated that 73 percent of the people favored doing away with the convention system of nominating candidates for President and Vice President and placing in its stead the nationwide nominating primary.

Since the staging of the 1952 conventions, which was taken into the American homes for the first time by television, I am convinced that there is a greater demand than ever before for a change.

The people saw for themselves how conventions were operated, how party hacks and political back-room maneuvers operated right in full view of the public. I don't think the people liked it. In my opinion, they want this great power taken out of the hands of a few professional policitians and restored to the people where under our system of democracy, it belongs.

I had hoped that after the 1952 conventions, the Congress would return here and promptly take steps to make the reforms whose need is so clearly indicated. We did have some hearings, Mr. President, but no action resulted.

We are now virtually upon the eve of the 1956 campaigns. Within a very few months—less than a year—the speechmaking, the handshaking, and the organizing will be underway. Thirteen months from today the first primary will be held in New Hampshire, and there may be as many as 20 other primaries in advance of the political conventions. That's fine and all to the good, but what about the people of the other 27 States? Eighty-two million people in the United States have a voice in the selection of their party candidates. Are not the other 78 million people likewise entitled to an equal voice?

Yet here we are just 13 months away from our first Presidential primary in a State. We are going to have to get busy if we are to do anything by 1956. Even now it may be too late for 1956; if it is, we should start right now in anticipation of the primaries for 1960.

I am just as much in favor of changing the electoral college as anyone else. That is a change long needed. But that is not all that is needed.

The proposal that I have before the Senate—Senate Joint Resolution 9—calls for a reform of the electoral college. But, in addition, it calls for establishment of the national primary. It also proposes a change in succession to the Presidency in the event of the death in office of the President.

Mr. President, I hope that we may get some action. The public has long awaited action by Congress on this vital subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning business is closed.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR FRED HERBERT BROWN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Fred Herbert Brown, formerly a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, passed away at his home in Somersworth, N. H., last Thursday, February 3. New Hampshire mourns the loss of a distinguished son.

My colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably absent, filling an engagement in his home State. When he returns he will wish to speak of his memory of Senator Brown, with whom he served both in this body and for many years on the public service commission of New Hampshire.

Fred Brown's career reads like a thrilling and romantic story. Born in the little town of Ossipee, he was educated at Dartmouth College where he was an outstanding baseball star. In his early years he played professional baseball in minor leagues and then on the Boston Braves. After graduating from Boston University Law School, he settled in the city of Somersworth and practiced law there. He climbed the ladder of public office: mayor of Somersworth, United States District Attorney, Governor of New Hampshire, and finally, United States Senator.

New Hampshire is an overwhelmingly Republican State. In the 90 years since the Civil War it has had but 2 Democrat governors, 1 elected in 1912 when the Bull Moose movement split the majority party, and Fred Brown, elected Governor in 1922. Since the Civil War, New Hampshire has had but 2 Democrat United States Senators, 1 elected under the same circumstances in 1912, and the other Senator Brown, elected in 1932. I would not refer to political affiliations which fade into insignificance when the time of parting comes. I mention them because the fact that Fred H. Brown was the only member of the minority party to win the highest offices in the gift of the people of New Hampshire in a straight two-party battle is eloquent testimony of the unique place he held in the hearts of men and women of all parties in the Granite State.

He was the intimate friend of two Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. After his service in the Senate, President Roosevelt appointed him Comptroller General of the United States, but the stroke which began his long illness compelled him to resign shortly after his appointment. Later, the President called him to the Tariff Commission, but again his health made it impossible for him to serve. For 15 years he has been an invalid confined to his home at Somersworth where he has been visited by his friends and admirers with whom he served in public life both here and in New Hampshire.

We who knew him are saddened by his death, but the sadness is lightened by our realization that his long vigil is ended. After 15 years of dreary invalidism, he has passed to his eternal rest.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it was my high privilege to serve in the Senate with the late Senator Brown, of New

Hampshire. I desire to associate myself with the very eloquent tribute paid him by the distinguished junior Senator from that State.

Senator Brown's career served as an inspiration to the young men of this Nation. Because of his diligence, his patriotism, and his unswerving loyalty to his country and to those whom he served, he achieved the heights under great difficulties. He was a great public servant, and I know that the people of New Hampshire appreciate his many contributions to the welfare of that State and of the Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to join with a number of my colleagues in paying tribute to the life, the useful public service, and the character of the late Senator Fred Brown, of New Hampshire. It was my privilege, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in 1939, to meet and to come to know Senator Brown.

He had a distinguished career as a public servant in the State of New Hampshire and as a Member of the United States Senate. He was progressive, forward-looking, and always interested in the small-business man and the farmer. He proposed and helped to enact a great many worthwhile laws which are now on our statute books.

Later he was appointed Comptroller General of the United States, in which position he rendered excellent service for a few months. Unfortunately he had to retire because of ill health.

After a period of convalescence and recovery, he was again appointed, by President Roosevelt, who had a very high opinion of Senator Brown, as a Member of the Tariff Commission.

Senator Brown was always interested in the young Members of the House and of the Senate. He was always willing to take time to discuss their problems with them, as it was my privilege to talk with him on a number of occasions.

In 1952, at Somersworth, New Hampshire, where he lived, I had the privilege of calling on Senator Brown on two occasions. At that time he was an invalid and bedridden, but his mind was alert. He maintained a continued interest in the affairs of his country, in the proceedings of Congress, and in the personalities in the National Legislature.

I feel that the State of New Hampshire and the Nation have lost a very useful citizen. Many of us have lost a personal friend. I wish to join in extending my sympathy to the members of the late Senator's family.

"PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE" PROPAGANDA OF SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the replacement of Georgi Malenkov by Marshal Bulganin as Premier of the Soviet Union demonstrates anew several things:

First. The unending bitter struggle for power among the Soviet leaders—a struggle which may intensify rather than lessen now.

Second. The fact that the free world definitely cannot rely upon the so-called peaceful coexistence theme which Malenkov had been stressing for some months.

So long as a Soviet foreign policy trend can be established at the whim of one of the members of a dictatorial clique, it can also be upset by a change in that clique.

Regardless of individual changes in the Kremlin, however, the fact of the matter is that its overall strategy, aimed at world revolution, has remained unchanged, even during the period of Malenkov's ascendancy.

The free world should not indulge in any wishful thinking that the Soviet problem will solve itself merely because of these eruptions in the struggle for power. The latest defense budget in which the Soviet Union spends, in effect, more than ever before—112 billion rubles for arms, or around $28 billion—is far more meaningful than any temporary propaganda line which the Reds adopt.

Khrushchev, who is apparently riding high, gives every indication of continuing to emphasize heavy war industry at the expense of consumer items.

To the extent that Khrushchev's position has been strengthened by the latest change, the danger to the free world has not lessened.

THE SITUATION IN ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, viewpoints on the situation in Asia with which I wish to associate myself. They are in the form of a series of articles written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, an article written by Marquis Childs, appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, and an article written by Joseph Alsop, appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday morning.

By way of comment on the series Mr. President, I desire to say that it is exceedingly interesting to note that since the passage of the joint resolution a few days ago numerous articles written by some of the keenest students of American foreign relations, such as Mr. Lippmann, Professor Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, Mr. Marquis Childs, Mr. Alsop, and professors of foreign relations in a great many American universities, have been writing articles which I think expressed the fears by some of us on the floor of the Senate who could not go along with the resolution. We could not go along because of what we regarded as the increasing danger of the Nationalist Chinese involving the United States in a war in Asia, which would result in the unnecessary sacrifice of many American boys.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 8, 1955]

TOWARDS A CEASE-FIRE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The evacuation of the Tachens has now begun, and if it is successful, which we need not doubt, the position will be stronger and safer than it was before.

A great deal has been said and written about how important it is to hold positions of strength. The Tachens were not a position of strength. They were a military and political liability. They could not be defended except at the risk of a general war which no one in his senses would undertake for such unimportant territory. The Chinese Nationalist troops on them had nothing useful to do, and they were in a military trap—like the French at Dien Bien Phu. Had they been lost, instead of being evacuated, Chiang would have made the same military error as the French made when they locked up a garrison at Dien Bien Phu, locked it up in an outpost of no decisive importance which could not be defended. The story in Indochina might well have been different from what it is today if a policy of evacuation from indefensible outposts to concentrated strong points had been carried out.

These considerations apply to the other offshore islands, and the sound American policy would be to follow up what is being done in the Tachens by doing the same thing in Quemoy and Matsu. This is the surest way to carry out the policy which the President laid down in his message to Congress. The policy is to keep Formosa and the Pescadores out of unfriendly hands, and to bring about a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. There is one way by which at present Formosa can be defended. That is by American military power. But there are two ways in which the policy of the cease-fire can be put into effect. The one—which we have been attempting—is to negotiate a cease-fire with Peiping. If they would agree to it, they would tacitly assent not to attack Formosa and we—so it is generally understood—would in return bring about either the neutralization or the evacuation of the offshore islands.

This way of arriving at a cease-fire has been rebuffed angrily by Chou En-lai. We ought not to be surprised. It was wishful thinking to suppose that the Chinese government, which has won the civil war on the mainland, would appear as a nonmember before the Security Council in which China is represented by a faction that is no longer on the Chinese mainland. It was no less wishful to suppose that the Red Chinese would publicly sign a cease-fire which meant that they had renounced the right to complete the defeat of Chiang and to recover by force the island of Formosa.

It is most improbable that the cease-fire can be obtained by public agreement either in the U. N. or in any other kind of conference.

There is, however, another way to bring about the cease-fire for which the United States national policy calls. It can be done by direct American action, and it does not depend upon the negotiation of an agreement with Peiping. This is to do in Quemoy and Matsu what we are doing in the Tachens—to evacuate them not as the result of a bargain but as a strategic measure to liquidate a position of weakness, and to fall back on Formosa, which is a genuine position of strength.

Once that is done, there will be in fact, whatever Peiping may or may not agree to, a practical cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. Pin-prick bombing and shooting and raiding, which the Nationalists do from these offshore islands, will stop. There will be a hundred miles of blue water between Red China, which has no navy, and Formosa, which we are defending. In a military sense this will be for all practical purposes a cease-fire between the two Chinas—as there is between the whales and the elephants who cannot get at one another. Formosa will not be in Peiping's military orbit. The fantasy of putting Chiang back on the mainland by an all-out American war will have been dissipated. The risk of a great war over trifling islands will have been greatly

reduced. We shall have protected our genuine, as distinguished from our fictitious interests, and we shall have the moral and political support of our allies.

It will be said by some that to evacuate the islands is appeasement. But if we are talking about appeasement and about prestige, which is the firmer American policy: to sell these islands for a cease-fire, treating them as pawns in a bargain, or get rid of them as military and political legal liabilities, and to take a stand on a line—that of Formosa and the Pescadores—which is a defensible legal line, a defensible strategical line, which is a sound political line in that it has the support of our allies? I think it is more dignified to evacuate the islands for our own reasons than to sell them to obtain the benefits of a truce. We can have the benefits of the truce without bargaining and by our own voluntary action.

There is only one considerable doubt about this policy. It is whether Chiang can be induced to agree to it without demoralizing his army and his officialdom. There is no denying that that could happen. But we have to remember that if it is going to happen because of the evacuation of the offshore islands, it is going to happen anyway. For the administration has taken the fundamental decision not to support a war for the reconquest of the mainland. It cannot be sound policy to use Quemoy and Matsu as a way of allowing the Formosan Chinese to deceive themselves into thinking that the administration does not mean what it says. It cannot be sound policy to use these islands as bait to the Formosan Chinese, as a way of causing them to keep on thinking that the United States can be pushed, pulled, ensnared, and entangled into the kind of war that the United States has decided not to wage.

We cannot go on forever, or for long, sacrificing the national interests of the United States to our fears and to our guesses of what will and what will not happen to the morale of Chiang's regime. If our true interest is to evacuate the offshore islands and to stand on the legal line of Formosa and the Pescadores, then we owe it to the people of this country to follow our true interest, refusing to let high policy be controlled by the internal politics of the Formosa regime.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 7, 1955]

A MAIN CLUE

(By Walter Lippmann)

In calculating the risks and in estimating the probabilities in the Far East, we need an explanation of the fact that both Peking and Washington talk as if the struggle to seize Formosa were a near possibility. Yet, except for the lone voice of Joseph Alsop, who thinks that the intelligence estimates of Chinese power may be unreliable, the general assumption is that the Red Chinese do not have the military means needed to conquer Formosa. They have no navy and the hundred miles of water in the Formosa Strait are guarded by the most powerful navy in the world. Yet, as Mr. Alsop says, "The Peking government has been promising its people to take Formosa this year at the top of its voice" and "it is really hard to see why the brilliant Chou En-lai should have engaged Peking's prestige to the very hilt, if the threat to Formosa is a mere vainglorious maneuver.

Mr. Alsop's point is, I believe, well taken. The question then is why Chou En-lai, who has no navy, can afford to talk about conquering an island a hundred miles out at sea? How does he think he can capture Formosa this year, or even next year? The answer to this question, and the answer to many of the obscurities and ambiguities in the whole problem, is that Chou En-lai is counting upon the instability of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Formosa. He could not be promising to "liberate" Formosa soon unless he hoped and believed that the Chinese army and officials might do on Formosa what was done so often during the civil war on the mainland—that is to say, to change sides and to make peace.

If this is the basis of Chou En-lai's hope, it is the basis of Washington's underlying fears. No doubt we believe that Chiang's regime is more solid than Chou En-lai is assuming it to be. But a dominating consideration in our whole Chinese policy is the knowledge that the regime at Formosa is fragile and that to keep it going everything must be done to bolster its morale. If the Administration felt sure that Chiang's regime in Formosa were solid, it would not hesitate much longer to recognize it for what it really is—as the government not of China but of Formosa. The block to that policy is the well-grounded fear that the Chinese in Formosa would not settle down peacefully as exiles but would come to terms with the mainland Chinese.

The Chinese on Formosa tell us, and Americans who are in close touch with them believe, that Chiang's regime would crumble in disaffection and intrigue if there were cut off the practical hope of a return to the mainland. Whether or not this is the fact, the Formosan Chinese insist on it and their supporters in Washington agree with it. Yet the fact of the matter is that the United States Government has not only abandoned hope of a restoration but has put its decision in this matter in writing in connection with the proposed Formosa pact.

Nevertheless, in Formosa the decision is not regarded as final and conclusive. The speculation is still alive that the United States will be and can be drawn into a great war in which Chiang might be able to return to the mainland. The administration, afraid that morale might crumble, has allowed the government in Formosa to nourish this hope. It has at least refrained from dashing it conclusively. This desire to keep up Chiang's spirits by letting him go on hoping for war is almost surely the real reason for the costly and dangerous fuzziness about the offshore islands. These islands are not part of the strategic defense of Formosa. They are symbols of a conceivable return to the mainland.

The administration does not have a clear policy. There is in it a basic contradiction which will in one form or another have to be resolved.

On the other hand, there is the decision not to support an attempt by Chiang to return to the mainland. This decision carries with it the unavoidable conclusion that Chiang's government in Formosa is not the government of China, and that it is not entitled to the Chinese seat in the United Nations.

On the other hand, there is the desire to keep Formosa out of Red Chinese control, and the assumption that the only way to do this is by supporting the Chinese Government in Formosa.

The combination of these two decisions would be the policy of the two Chinas, and it would be a feasible policy if only one uncertainty could be removed. That is whether the Chinese in Formosa would stay in Formosa and would not make their peace with Peking. If we could be sure of that, which we cannot be, the defense of Formosa ought to be quite feasible.

Chou En-lai's hopes are based on the belief that the Chinese in Formosa can be induced to come over to his side. We are not sure that they cannot be induced to do that. It is not a comfortable situation and that is why everyone who is serious about this business feels that he is standing on very uncertain ground.

We have staked a lot on the reliability of Chiang's regime. Yet in deciding, as our own vital interest required, against supporting his return to the mainland, we have done what is most likely to sow fatal doubts within his regime. To offset these doubts, to preserve the morale of the Chinese of Formosa, we have felt compelled to become entangled in the Chinese civil war on the offshore islands. So we find ourselves unable to draw a clear line or to take an intelligent position that can command the support of world opinion.

MUTUAL DEFENSE PACT

(By Marquis Childs)

The close relationship between Nationalist China and the United States, which has been one of the most troubling factors in formulating American foreign policy, is being formalized in a mutual defense pact. Virtually no interest has been shown in hearings on the pact by either proponents or opponents.

Many Senators believe that since Congress overwhelmingly approved the Formosa resolution, the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek is a mere formality. The Eisenhower resolution commits the United States to defend Formosa and the Pescadores and other related territories should their defense be necessary in protecting Chiang's island bastion.

But the treaty is a mutual commitment, and for the Nationalist Chinese this is an important distinction. The Eisenhower resolution is a unilateral statement of policy which can be altered at any time that American policymakers wish to change it.

But the doubts over America's course in formalizing this link with Chiang will persist. As was pointed out during the debate on the Formosa resolution, there is an imporant discrepancy between the treaty and the resolution. The latter puts the umbrella of American protection over other related territories, a phrase interpreted to mean the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. The treaty is restricted solely to Formosa and the Pescadores.

During the debate on the resolution this discrepancy was pointed out by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, one of the leading conservatives in the Senate. An Eisenhower supporter who declared his intention of voting for the resolution, BYRD nevertheless sharply challenged the commitment to Chiang. He said:

"Can we underwrite the conduct and operations of Nationalist Chinese garrisons in their day-to-day, hour-to-hour contacts with a military aggressive enemy? Should we obligate ourselves for whatever force is necessary to maintain these garrisons in their extremely exposed positions? * * * Such circumstances are virtually certain to open wide the door for a shooting war on the mainland of China with all of its disastrous consequences."

BYRD offered his statement in connection with his vote in favor of an amendment which would have stricken from the Formosa resolution the phrase, "other related territories," and would thereby have eliminated responsibility for defense of the offshore islands. But the Senator from Virginia went on to raise these doubts about the mutual defense pact:

"* * * If the pending treaty is ratified, we would enter into close partnership, on equal terms, with Chiang Kai-shek, the undisputed leader of the Republic of China * * *. For his purposes, Chiang Kai-shek knows better than anyone else that he can never set foot on China again without American planes, troops, and ships. As a Senator, it is my considered opinion that Chiang Kai-shek is motivated by self-interest; that when the critical time comes he may place his ambitions above the welfare of his American partner."

There are those who hope that the Formosa resolution is the beginning of a new China policy which will evolve in the months ahead. While a formal cease-fire may not be possible, particularly since Chou En-lai, Communist foreign minister, has refused the invitation to come to the United Nations to

discuss a cease-fire resolution, a cease-fire in fact may result.

Through diplomatic negotiations the way may be prepared for Red China's admittance to the U. N. on a two-China basis. There are already rumors of a package deal which would admit Communist China along with Spain, Italy, Finland, and other countries long excluded by the Russian veto. If America's allies were to favor such an arrangement, it would be hard for this country to stand alone in opposition.

This is precisely the fear of those who want to keep Red China isolated. They count on the fanaticism of China's leaders to reject any solution the West would consider reasonable. And for the long pull, an isolated China, as they see it, will be subject to internal stresses and strains that are self-destructive. This last may be wishful thinking, but that has been a major ingredient through the years in America's China policy.

THE ENEMY BUILDUP

(By Joseph Alsop)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—The buildup and the current deployment of Chinese Communist military power ought to give pause to those who regard the Formosa crisis as a mere passing flurry.

Since the Korean truce, important ground and air forces have been transferred southward to the coastal provinces which are the natural jump-off points for an attack on Formosa and/or Formosa's offshore islands. And the modernization of Red China's land army has, meanwhile gone rapidly forward, so that most of this huge force is now almost as well equipped as the Soviet Union infantry.

Authoritative intelligence sources now credit the Peking government with regular ground forces with a strength of more than 3,100,000. These are organized in 210 infantry divisions, 22 artillery divisions, 6 armored divisions, plus considerable numbers of independent tank and artillery regiments, engineer regiments, and cavalry outfits.

On the ground, the post-Korean redeployment has been dramatic. At the end of the fighting, the Chinese had 17 of their armies on the Korean front. Seven of these armies (composed of 3 divisions each and equaling an American corps) have now been transferred out of Korea into China proper.

Three armies from Korea, the 12th, the 20th and the 26th, have been sent down to Chekiang and Kiangsu provinces, where the force threatening the Tachen Islands is massed. A fourth army from Korea, the 60th, is in first reserve position at Nanking. Three more armies from Korea are in North China, close to the north-south railroads that can carry them rapidly to the Yangtse Valley.

The Chekiang-Kiangsu force, immediately threatening the Tachens, now comprises four armies in all. Further south, in Fukien Province, across the narrow waters from Quemoy and the Matsu Islands, there is a second large mass of troops comprising 3 armies. None of these armies in Fukien, however, is of Korean origin.

The air redeployment has followed almost exactly the same pattern. Before the Korean armistice, the main strength of the Chinese Communist air force of just under 2,000 combat planes was stationed in Manchuria, to support the ground troops at the Korean front. In this period, the dispositions along the China coast were obviously defensive.

Now, however, an additional 500 aircraft, including 5 air divisions of MIG 15's, have been transferred southward. Instead of being in the north, the main strength of the Communist air force is thus concentrated in Chekiang, Kiangsu and the lower Yangtse Valley, where the air-base building program has been intensive. And there is a secondary concentration, of 5 additional air divisions, in the more southerly region around Canton.

In the air picture, however, there is one important difference from the ground picture. There is a striking gap in Fukien Province, in the immediate neighborhood of Quemoy and the Matsus. No air units are as yet stationed here. Only one, Fukien airfield, at Foochow, is fully ready to support jet operations. In view of the distances involved and the short range of the MIG 15, the Communists would, therefore, find it difficult, at this time, to use their most important plane in large numbers in support of assaults on Quemoy or the Matsus.

The slow but inexorable movement of all forces southward points to an eventual attack on Quemoy and the Matsus and, beyond much doubt, on the main island of Formosa.

In short, what the Communists can do if they choose to risk the consequences is only too grimly clear. What they will do is not by any means so clear. But the consensus in Taipeh, which seems logical to this reporter, is not particularly encouraging.

In brief, it is plain for all the world to see that President Eisenhower is hoping that evacuation of the Tachens plus a show of firmness about the other islands, will eventually enable him to make a deal. Quemoy and the Matsus are to be traded for a promise of toleration of the Nationalists on Formosa. Two Chinas, one small and in the process of withering away, the other vast and growing stronger by the month, are thus to be recognized.

This must look logical in Washington. But the consensus here, even among the few who favor such a deal, is that the President will not get what he wants by mere hints that he may perhaps fight for Quemoy and the Matsus. It seems likely, rather, that the President will have to prove he means it, by actually fighting for those islands when the time comes.

FACING THE FACTS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, too often we are impressed not with what a speaker says but rather the manner in which he says it. We pay too much attention to the form instead of the substance. We are too often carried away with the mellifluous orator who, in tones of pleasing resonance and intriguing gestures, whispers and coos sweet nothings to us and tells us only that which we want to hear. Too rarely do we hear an honest speaker exhibit the courage to tell us the facts and tell us what we should hear and are entitled to know.

I will take the courageous and honest speaker anytime over the mellifluous orator. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, is the honest and courageous kind of speaker. He proved that in my home State of Maine on February 2, 1955, at Fort Fairfield, when he made a speech I should like every Member of the Senate to read. And so I request that his speech be printed in the RECORD for that purpose.

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

LET'S FACE THE FACTS

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson)

This is my first visit to Maine since becoming Secretary of Agriculture and it is a great pleasure for me to be here with your Governor, Senator Smith, Congressman McIntyre, Dean Deering, and all you. We in the Department of Agriculture and you in Maine are very fortunate in your entire delegation in Congress. They have kept us closely informed on your agricultural problems and programs. They are intensely interested in your welfare. They have been most helpful to us in the Department and we shall continue to work closely with them.

I was greeted by another pleasure when I got off the train and saw all this snow. Snow is something that I have missed since coming to Washington 2 years ago. So it was an engaging sight to see the Maine landscape covered with this charming white mantle.

At the same time I recognize that all of this precipitation coming on top of your abnormally rainy summer creates additional problems for Maine farmers.

We in the Department of Agriculture are very much concerned over the difficulties you have been having. Your Senators and Congressmen have told me that few of the major agricultural commodities produced by Maine farmers had a good year in 1954. I understand that dairy producers did better than others, but the dairy situation certainly has not been one to arouse great joy. I know. We have been struggling with dairy problems for many months, and it is only recently that we have been able to see definite signs that the situation is on the upturn. We do see such signs now.

There is an unmistakable trend toward a better balance between dairy supplies and demand—a balance which is being brought about not through distasteful and uneconomic production controls, but rather through voluntary adjustments in production and increased consumption of the health-giving dairy foods.

This past December, milk production was 1 percent below December of a year ago. Dairymen are bringing their production into line with market demand.

Our Government-owned stocks of butter have come down sharply during the past 6 months. Last summer we owned 466 million pounds; on January 12 we held 262 million pounds. Stocks of cheese have recently been reduced by more than 100 million pounds. In December, the Government bought not a single pound of butter, the first month of no purchases in 2 years.

Your poultry industry, like poultry everywhere, has been hard hit by falling prices. But we now can foresee the end of the cost-price squeeze which egg and poultry producers have faced during the last season. Indeed, egg prices at the farm level have increased contraseasonally in the last few weeks. Poultry prices likewise have improved in recent weeks.

In response to the relatively low market prices of last fall, fewer chicks are now moving out for laying flock replacement next spring. Prices next summer and fall should be substantially above those of last season, thus permitting efficient producers to experience more normal profit levels.

Your orchards were hurt by hurricanes Carol and Edna, which, I am told, stripped the trees of most of their fruit.

And Maine potato growers, as we all know, are in their third successive year of adversity.

Last year Maine potato growers had to fight continuously against the elements in planting, cultivation, disease control, and harvest. Your production costs were among the highest on record. Other areas of the Nation suffered from drought, but in Maine the potato-growing areas suffered from too much rain. Your problem of blight control was aggravated and even frequent spraying of your fields did not produce satisfactory results. Rain made the harvest difficult and poor. It required extra careful conditioning of the crop for storage to prevent spoilage.

And now this year you must compete with growers in areas less distant from terminal markets, where growing conditions have

been favorable, and good quality crops have been the rule.

Well might you say, "These are the times that try men's souls."

They are indeed trying times.

But the people of Maine have stood firm under economic gales before. You are the same resolute stock as those who peopled this land in an earlier century. You have their spunk and their heart.

Here at Fort Fairfield in 1774 a few hardy pioneers settled in what was then a vast wilderness. They paved the way for the busy rural community of neat homes that we see here today. They and their followers set in motion the train of events that led to the typical Maine farm of today, with its well-kept fields, its large barns, and trim white house encircled by lovely orchard trees.

With a background of this kind, you farmers of Maine are, I know, determined to do what needs to be done to build a sound and prosperous future for your agriculture.

And speaking for the Department of Agriculture, I pledge you our whole-souled cooperation.

What are the ingredients that must go into the building of this sound and prosperous future?

I'm sure I don't know all the ingredients, but I do know some. I know we must have the facts. Facts are the road maps of economic progress. Second, we must face the facts honestly, which means interpreting them with scrupulous objectivity. Now what are some of the facts that we know about potatoes?

We know that potatoes are one of our primary foods. In terms of farm income potatoes are one of the top 10 crops.

We know that the industry has been noted for its outstanding, capable leaders.

We know that the industry has demonstrated the ability to overcome many adverse production and marketing situations. Having done it before, we are confident that you can do it again. And our confidence has been strengthened by the current activities of your industry organizations—the Maine Potato Industry Council, your Young Farmers Association, and your local potato growers associations such as the one here in Fort Fairfield. These organizations can continue to perform an increasingly valuable service by pooling ideas and working jointly toward the solution of common problems.

Another basic fact that we know and must face is this: Except for 1 or 2 years, there has been a consistent overproduction of Maine potatoes in relation to demand since 1943.

Production of Maine potatoes has been running substantially higher than it did during the 1930's. Commercial shipments, on the other hand, have been lower. Carlot shipments from the 1954 Maine crop will probably be 25 percent less than the prewar average.

There are only two alternative solutions to this problem of overproduction: Either your markets must be expanded or your production must be curtailed.

Maine currently seems to be able to market successfully about the same quantity of potatoes as before the war. With the present high yields, this means that 125,000 to 135,000 acres in a normal year will give you adequate production.

The Department has for a number of years issued acreage guides for potatoes and other vegetables. The guides are based on our best appraisal of market requirements for the Nation. They are broken down to each State on the basis of the current production pattern. We issue these acreage guides to provide growers, shippers, suppliers, credit institutions, and other persons interested in the industry with our best judgment of the acreage level which, under current market conditions and with an orderly marketing program, should be expected to reflect a fair price return to growers.

We have just released the 1955 potato acreage guide for Maine. It recommends 132,600 acres. This is about 7 percent more than last year's guide, but 15 percent less than last year's harvested acreage.

Just in passing, let me say that we would welcome the opportunity, through our service agencies and your State extension service, to explain and discuss fully the basis for this guide with all growers and other interested groups.

You have serious marketing problems this year. The leadership of the Maine potato industry, recognizing these difficulties, recommended that a marketing-agreement program be applied. This is another indication of your willingness to face the facts, especially as they concern the shipping of low-grade potatoes to terminal points where they would meet the competition of better-quality potatoes from other areas.

The marketing-agreement program you have adopted this year, through referendum, is a move to help the industry in Maine by keeping low-grade potatoes out of competition. The current shipping regulations may, because of the quality of your 1954 crop, keep 25 to 30 percent or even more of the crop off the market. I believe that these regulations have contributed significantly toward improving the market prices, and I think it is extremely fortunate that the marketing-order regulations were available for use this season in view of the grade and size composition of your crop.

This, however, leaves the problem of disposition of low-grade and cull potatoes. It is a matter to which we have given a great deal of study.

Early in January your congressional delegation recommended that we consider a starch-diversion program with a Government subsidy on these lower grades and sizes to increase the price to farmers. We discussed this proposal thoroughly with your congressional group. It was agreed that we should wait until the January 1 stocks reports were available before making a decision.

As you know, the Department announced last week that a starch-diversion program would not be undertaken at this time. I assure you this was not an easy decision to make. It is much simpler sometimes to say "Yes" than to say "No." But I feel very deeply that "yes" would have been the wrong answer at this time. Let me tell you why.

A careful appraisal of the prospective situation for the balance of the 1954 crop season points to a favorable outlook. Market prices this year are well above last year and there has been a moderate increase since the first of the year. The stocks report of 10 million bushels less than last year has been received with a considerable degree of confidence by the potato industry. Merchantable stocks do not appear greatly to exceed requirements. Here in the Northeast particularly, these stocks are only 4 million bushels more than the short supply of 3 years ago; also, shrinkage during the rest of the season probably will continue to be greater than normal. This will further reduce the supply of good-quality potatoes.

For these reasons, we concluded that market prospects do not justify a diversion program on the lower grades of potatoes. Nevertheless, we are keeping the market developments under continuing review.

Our decision, moreover, was determined by the long-range view as well as by the immediate situation.

Assume that a starch-diversion program were started with the Department paying a subsidy of, say, 60 cents per barrel for all potatoes above culls going into the factories. How much good—or how much harm—would this shot-in-the-arm type of treatment do to the Maine potato industry?

It would, of course, increase the total returns to potato growers this year. But in the normal course of events, higher returns mean larger acreage planted next year and greater marketing difficulties. More fundamentally, however, an artificially high price on the poorer quality potatoes is not a basically sound approach. Why should pickouts and strip-stock be regarded as part of the merchantable supply for tablestock shipments? A subsidized starch price might well do more harm than good by deferring full recognition by growers that these potatoes are really worth only their actual salvage value. It comes down once again to a question of fact and a willingness to face the fact.

I will not hesitate one moment to approve a price-assistance program—whenever it lightens the immediate economic burden and does not interfere with the important long-range objectives. But I do not believe we wish—or can afford—to sacrifice the future to the present. American farmers—and New England farmers particularly—are not penny-wise and pound-foolish.

There is reason to feel that the price-support programs of a few years ago were an instance in which potato growers unwittingly may have sacrificed the future to the present. You recall what happened in years of big supply. Early potatoes went to market; but where did Maine potatoes go? They stayed in storage. It became a highly unsatisfactory situation. It was a program that broke down under its own weight—but not before it hurt the potato industry in the estimation of the American people and cost the taxpayers $478 million. It led to legislation specifically excluding potatoes from support provisions.

That is why I am so deeply convinced that we must weigh all programs on the scales of both future and present effects.

We are well aware that many Maine farmers have unusual credit requirements especially this year because of the losses they have suffered.

Loans from the Farmers' Home Administration have helped Maine potato growers keep going during rather critical periods. Last year the FHA made available to Maine an additional allotment of production and subsistence loan funds amounting to approximately $1½ million. These loans helped finance the operations of family-type farms in the Aroostook potato area.

We are quite proud of the way this loan program was handled. In developing the operating plans, production costs per acre were held to a minimum. As a result it was possible to make loans that were clearly within the ability of the borrowers to repay. The records show also that farmers who were assisted by these loans reduced their acreage substantially.

While the FHA does not have comparable production and subsistence funds for allotment this year, it does have authority and funds for making emergency loans. This authority grows out of the designation of Maine as an emergency loan area following the hurricanes last fall. As a result the operating loan program this year will be operated on substantially the same basis as last year.

We have been talking thus far mostly about efforts to stabilize the potato industry in Maine through production adjustment, and marketing regulations. Before passing on to another area in this discussion, I want to reemphasize the vital importance of growers' planting within the recommended acreage guides announced by the Department. Let us face the facts. Acreage planted in excess of the guides in various States has in the past resulted in excess production and disorderly marketing conditions. This was particularly true, as you all know, for the 1953 crop-marketing season.

Adjusting production to market requirements will mean better prices and more in-

come. This is just commonsense. Too much production glutting the market gives about the same results as too many boys around the fishing hole. Nobody gets any fish.

At the same time, we recognize that adjusting production raises the question of what to do with the idle acres. Maine farmers, like those in many other States, have been trying to deal with this problem through more diversification, and that is certainly a logical solution. You have increased your dairy production in Maine. Poultry now brings in considerably more of the State's farm income than potatoes. Egg production for the use of hatcherymen is building up, and there has also been an increase in egg production for table use. Broiler production was 5 to 10 percent higher in 1954 than in 1953. Turkey production increased by about one-fourth. Maine farmers are growing more grain for poultry feed, and to some extent are using combines for harvest, which indicates that they are very seriously in the grain business.

Obviously, then, diversification has made important strides. But there is always more that can be done. I urge you to explore the situation thoroughly. Our departmental agencies are available to work very closely with you. The Extension Service is pushing ahead with its farm unit approach—a program designed to get the most out of the farm's total resources. The Farmers Home Administration helps small farmers with credit and a sound plan of operation.

I want to repeat what I consider to be the theme of my remarks—that we are interested in your problems; that our agencies are your agencies; and that they exist to serve you.

Let us turn now to an examination of the possibilities of expanding markets for Maine potatoes.

Here again we must have facts. What are the facts behind the decline in commercial shipments of Maine potatoes?

We feel that among the major causes are these:

Competition from other areas; loss of Maine's premium quality; the national decline in consumption of potatoes; and Maine's shorter marketing season and smaller marketing area.

Changing freight rate relationships have affected the competitive position of the major potato-producing areas.

The concentration of potato production among fewer commercial growers has brought improved grading practices in many areas. This has lessened the big market premium which once existed for Maine potatoes. Washing of potatoes and other vegetables is the common practice for all important production areas except the Northeast; this may also have affected market-price relationships. Moreover, the variation in eating quality among the many different varieties produced in Maine has certainly not helped.

The decline in per capita consumption of potatoes is important.

Potato consumption per person has fallen at least 20 percent since the 1930's.

The marketing season for the bulk of the sales of Maine potatoes is much shorter than it was 20 years ago. The bulk of the movement is now confined to the January through April period. For example, a yearly average of 11,000 carloads were shipped before December 1 during the 1930's as compared to 2,000 cars this year and 5,500 cars last year. A higher proportion of the commercial shipments are being made to Massachusetts, New York, and nearby States with a sharp decrease in shipments into the southeastern area.

A careful and unified analysis by the industry groups in Maine of these factors and some of their underlying causes should prove helpful as a move toward expanding your potato market. Again, the Department is eager to help by supplying more detailed market information. We are starting this year to separate the summer crop in most of the so-called late States where it is important and will report both a summer and fall crop. A much better estimate of the potential storage stocks will thus be available several months earlier in the season.

We announced last week that reports of storage stocks of merchantable potatoes will be issued for February 1 and March 1 this year. In fact representatives of the potato industry have raised the question of whether we should not have a more adequate reporting program every year. Our budget this year contains a request for funds to initiate an expansion of our reports on trucks receipts of potatoes and other fruits and vegetables in terminal markets. With an estimated 50 to 60 percent of the fresh fruits and vegetables now moving by truck, it is essential that our daily rail shipment and unload figures be supplemented by comparable data on truck movement. We hope eventually to be able to issue a combined daily report on the total unloads for all major markets in order to provide information urgently needed by the industry to gage the volume of movement and supplies on hand in the different markets.

If there are any two words which best describe the key to a sound and prosperous agriculture for Maine potato growers—and for United States agriculture generally—they are: Better marketing.

Sometimes it is said that a fundamental cause of highway accidents is that we have cars powered to go 120 miles an hour but roads designed for 50 miles an hour. So it is in the potato industry. Your productive machinery is powered to do 120 miles an hour, but the marketing channels are geared to a slower speed.

To improve marketing channels we must have more knowledge, more facts effectively applied. Consequently, we are seeking to give marketing and marketing research the emphasis it must have to complement our vast productive machine.

Of course there are some who would say: "Why have more research on potatoes? Research is largely responsible for the surpluses we have now."

But I know it isn't necessary to point out the fallacy in that opinion to Maine farmers—particularly since Maine potato growers were the first to go to their legislature and ask a tax on themselves for research and promotion to improve the industry. These funds that have been used for research and promotion are the cornerstone of your merchandizing program. Other States have flattered you by imitating your example.

And I know I don't need to sell marketing research to a group who were among the first to market potatoes in consumer-size packages.

But I do want to tell you some of the work that has been done or is now going forward, because I think it is an impressive portent of the sound and prosperous agriculture that is our common goal.

Much research is carried out in cooperation with State agricultural experiment stations, agricultural colleges, and industry.

Working together as a team, we spent nearly $900,000 in fiscal year 1954 on potato research. To a large extent we are guided by the Potato Research and Marketing Advisory Committee. This committee is made up of men who know potatoes, men who represent every phase of the industry.

Present research, of course, builds on the knowledge uncovered by past efforts.

For example, from 1948 to 1950 a study was made of grade quality and price relationships of potatoes in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York City. It showed that there were a high proportion of grade defects in the potatoes being offered to consumers. At about the same time the Department conducted a study of consumer preference for potatoes throughout the United States. This study indicated that consumers wanted and were willing to pay for uniformly sized clean potatoes.

As an outgrowth of such earlier studies specific research projects have analyzed the effect of washing, sizing, and sorting according to specific gravity upon the sales of potatoes in Boston and other important eastern markets. The findings are that consumers will pay more for potatoes graded for the purpose to which they are best suited—baking, boiling, or frying. These studies are being continued in retail stores in Syracuse this year.

The idea is to find out what Mr. and Mrs. Consumer want—then give it to them. It has taken agriculture a long time to learn what certain other industries have long known: the customer is nearly always right.

A year ago there were only a handful of potato washers in use in Maine. Now there are more than 100. I congratulate you on this excellent start toward a much-improved marketing practice.

We want to know more about the development of improved facilities, equipment, and handling methods for storing and packing. This work is just getting underway in Maine. It is being carried out cooperatively between the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station and the Department. Last fall a field station was established at Presque Isle where a research team of engineers, physiologists, and economists are working together on studies to reduce the costs of handling and packing potatoes and to reduce damage during distribution.

We are studying what happens to potatoes when they are stored at different temperatures. We want to find out the best way to store potatoes so that acceptable qualities can be guaranteed to the consumer.

In January and February last year we studied ways of protecting Maine potatoes against freezing when shipped by rail. The efficiency of various car heaters was investigated as well as preheating before loading and heating in transit.

We are working also on means of keeping potatoes dormant—preventing the sprouting that takes place along toward the end of the marketing season in late-crop potatoes. A number of sprout inhibitors have been tried and some of them show considerable promise of keeping potatoes dormant longer than is now possible and even at fairly high temperatures.

We are seeking facts on new and better ways to use potatoes, both as human food and for livestock and industrial uses.

We are giving special attention to the cause and control of market diseases. We want to know why potatoes sometimes turn gray or even black after cooking. We are keenly interested in all phases of potato processing technology.

We all know what improved processing has done for the citrus industry. And we have seen some of the results that can be obtained through procesing of potatoes. Out of the total quantity of potatoes used each year for human consumption in the United States, over 40 million bushels or about 15 percent are processed potato products. In 1940, by comparison, such products accounted for the annual use of only about 2 percent, or 5.4 million bushels out of the total quantity consumed for food. This could be only the beginning of a new and growing market.

For example, the manufacture of potato chips has become an important industry. It takes almost two-thirds of the total quantity of potatoes processed each year. The success of the chip industry can be credited largely to USDA research which has helped the industry determine the best varieties of potatoes for chips, the storage temperatures at which they yield the best product, and methods of conditioning and

processing, including cooking temperatures, oils used in cooking, and their effect on the end product. Further research was conducted last year on potato chip bars.

The use of prepeeled potatoes, especially by restaurants, is growing rapidly and there is room for far greater expansion. In an effort to appraise market outlets, a survey of United States firms marketing peeled potatoes was completed last August. There were 118 firms marketing peeled potatoes, and using about 3¼ million bushels of potatoes. In the East your Chef Special brand was favorably received by potato peeling firms and restaurants.

Maine has three potato food processing plants where frozen prepared potatoes are processed. The majority of frozen french-fried potatoes have been processed in Maine. This food item has been so well received that it is one of the most popular frozen vegetables.

Potato granules are a relatively new product on which considerable basic research was done by USDA last year and will be continued in 1955. They have possibilities for mass feeding and military uses. They could become a top item in processed potatoes.

Drum drying of potato flakes is a relatively new process on which experiment was emphasized in the past year because it holds greater promise than present procedures as a commercial method.

Pilot plant experiments using a double drum drier turned out flakes that can be made into mashed potatoes with texture, color, and flavor comparable to that of a high-grade baked potato. Future work on this product will investigate its storage stability, means of preventing off-flavors, use of emulsifiers, and other agents to upgrade lower solids content potatoes, and methods of cutting the product to produce flakes of uniform size.

Research went forward last year on potato puffs, an item in which consumer interest seems to be growing.

The Potato Research and Marketing Committee is especially interested in expanding extension programs of consumer education. The committee has suggested that extension increase its activity in training wholesalers, retailers, and secondary suppliers in better merchandising, and at country points, working with producers and marketing agencies on marketing methods and organization. The extension service in Maine, as you may know, has done an outstanding job in this whole field.

I hope you will not conclude that because I have devoted quite a lot of attention to marketing research, we are not interested in production research. We are interested—intensely so. We must continue to study and improve disease-resistant varieties. We must learn more, and yet more, about the best uses of insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides. Often it takes a long time to produce a new potato variety—and disease will not wait while we study. Potato breeders spent 14 years in developing the new Saco variety that was released last year.

Maine is the leading producer of certified seed. In order to improve the quality of your seed potatoes, your seed certification officials and producers pioneered in improving your foundation seed program by actually planting the foundation seed in Florida, thereby checking freedom from disease under field growing conditions. To further this program, you went still further and your State department of agriculture acquired a seed farm far off in the woods to insure isolation from other fields and to minimize the possibilities of subjecting them to disease.

We must push forward with research to lower costs of producing potatoes. Here in Maine you require from 30,000 to 40,000 pickers to harvest your crop. Wage rates, I am told, have tripled since 1943, so that the total harvest cost alone is as much as the price for which the entire crop has sometimes been sold. Mechanical advancements in potato harvesting seem to have lagged far behind progress in some other areas of agriculture.

Now I would like to sum up the fundamentals of this discussion by repeating again our intention—no, more than that, our determination—to do our utmost to help you build the strong and prosperous agriculture you want to have. Yes, our goal is a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture.

Today I pledge anew to you and to all of our farm people that I will never knowingly sponsor or support any policy or program which I believe is not in the best interests of our farmers and all of our people, regardless of political pressure.

You have problems, serious problems—let us all face that fact.

But the road leading to the solution of those problems seems fairly clear. Let us all work together toward the stabilization of the potato industry by adjusting production as well as possible to demand. Let us use the programs and services available for orderly marketing, for credit requirements, and for diversification. Let us push forward with research—especially marketing research—as the best long-term method of providing the facts upon which a better future can and will be built.

And let us always remember this solid truth:

The basis of a sound future in agriculture depends primarily upon what the farmers actually do for themselves. Programs originating in Washington can help to guard against economic pitfalls. They can provide information and technical knowledge to advance the frontiers of agricultural know-how. But the big job, the important job, the basic job, has always had to be done on the farm by the farmers themselves—and it always will.

Let us summon our strength to meet the challenge that confronts us. With God's help we shall succeed.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTING IN AMERICA—NATIONAL BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this week we observe the 45th anniversary of Boy Scouting in the United States. In this country there are 2,765,000 Boy Scouts, and approximately 1 million leaders who are giving their time in behalf of the Scout program.

I wish to extend my congratulations and best wishes to all of them on this occasion. As a member of the advisory committee of the Coronado Council of the State of Kansas I feel signally honored in having the privilege to make this statement. I know of no program that is doing more to promote clean living, Christian ideals, and good citizenship among our boys than Boy Scouting. Here I desire to recite the Boy Scout oath:

On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it was my privilege the other day to be presented with a Boy Scout badge—truly an honor—for there is nothing more pleasing than to have the confidence of young Americans.

This is Boy Scout Week. And the story of Boy Scout Week is told very well in a letter written to me by Tiger Conroy, a Cub Scout from St. Michael's School in Silver Spring, Md.—the young man who last week made the presentation of the Boy Scout badge to me.

I think the Members of this body would enjoy reading Tiger's letter, and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SILVER SPRING, MD., *February 4, 1955.*

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The following is a copy of my presentation speech which you asked me to jot down for you.

I am Cub Scout Tiger Conroy, from St. Michael's School in Silver Spring, Md.

During Boy Scout Week, February 6–13, the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 45th anniversary. As a representative of the Boy Scouts of America, we want you to join in our celebration by wearing this Scout badge during Boy Scout Week.

The Boy Scouts of America was chartered by Congress in 1916. Next week, Boy Scout Week, our Nation will honor its 3 million Scouts and leaders. In 45 years, more than 20 million men and boys have been members of the Boy Scout organization. Many of these boys have grown to become outstanding leaders.

The National Capital Area Council, which I represent, has a membership of 29,000 boys and over 11,000 adult leaders. We want you to say "Happy birthday" to the Boy Scouts of America by wearing this Scout badge during Boy Scout Week.

As a personal request, may I ask you to wear this pin in memory of my dad, who was born and educated in Portland, Maine, and, "in my books," was another grand person from the State of Maine.

Thank you, Senator, for your time and kindness. I am enclosing copies of the pictures which were taken in your office.

Very sincerely,

TIGER CONROY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues who have today expressed themselves in behalf of the Boy Scouts of America and of the week which has been dedicated to this splendid youth organization.

It has been my privilege for several years to be active in Scout work, and some years earlier to have been a scoutmaster for 6 years.

I look upon the Boy Scouts of America as the true answer to the so-called totalitarian youth movements of the Iron Curtain countries.

The Boy Scouts represent a national organization which develops good character and the other attributes of manhood second to none.

I feel that the American people owe this organization a great debt of gratitude. I hope the mothers and fathers of America will give more of their time and assistance to this outstanding group of young men, and to those who participate as their counselors and leaders.

Those who live in the District of Columbia and in the surrounding States are fortunate to have a growing Boy Scout organization.

I take particular pride in the Boy Scouts because only last week my 12-year old son received his second-class scout badge. I have an 11-year-old who will become a tenderfoot within a month.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on January 6, 1955, I introduced, for myself and on behalf of 25 other Senators, S. 49, a measure to enable Hawaii and Alaska to obtain statehood. In introducing the measure I had occasion to refer to the book, The State of Alaska, recently written by the distinguished former Governor of Alaska, the Honorable Ernest Gruening. I think all Members of the Senate will agree that Governor Gruening qualifies as an expert on Alaska and on statehood.

The statehood bill is under active consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, hearings having been scheduled to begin a week from Monday, February 21. Therefore, I am certain that all Members of the Senate will be interested in the review of The State of Alaska, by Father Paul C. O'Connor, which appears in the February 5, 1955, issue of the weekly magazine America. I feel certain that all of the Members of the Senate know that America is a leading Jesuit weekly which is widely read and widely respected.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that Father O'Connor's review of this timely study by Governor Gruening be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE STATE OF ALASKA

(By Ernest Gruening, Random House, 606 pages)

I think this is the first book that has ever been written about Alaska as Alaskans really see it. They have many grievances against both the policy of the Federal Government and absentee ownership. Alaskans have voiced their criticism in a thousand ways, but now, for the first time, we have a well-documented and incisive account of the whole history of Federal mismanagement. This short-sighted policy has gone on from the beginning and still paralyzes our great territory.

Former Governor Gruening knows his Alaska from top to bottom. I have met him time and time again in the most out-of-the-way places in Alaska. During his long tenure, of office, 14 years, he has studied it at firsthand from every possible vantage point. Mines, fisheries, lifelines, health conditions, housing problems, native claims, failure of law-enforcement, and, finally, Alaska's undying demand for statehood—all are given studied and revealing attention. The sources investigated are amazing.

This definitive history of America's northernmost frontier should interest every Member of Congress. From many intimate conversations with the former Governor I have always felt that his keen mind was ever seeking the best interests of Alaska. What I failed to realize until I read this book, was that all his ideas were backed up by a scholarly study of governmental policies from the time of our acquisition of Alaska from Russia.

This is a book I have no hesitation recommending to all students of politics, as well as to those interested in a well-documented history of Alaska. Its case against the Federal Government is difficult to refute. Given statehood, it would be almost impossible to mismanage Alaska as woefully as Congress has done. I was especially happy that Mr. Gruening has given the proper niche in history to two stalwart statesmen—delegates Anthony J. Diamond and Edward L. "Bob" Bartlett.

PAUL C. O'CONNOR.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in connection with Governor Gruening's book, the Senate will be interested to know that it was cited by the Supreme Court of the United States in the opinion handed down only yesterday in the Tee-Hit-Ton case. In the dissenting opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas, in which the Chief Justice and Justice Frankfurter concurred, Governor Gruening was referred to as "our foremost Alaskan authority," and his book, The State of Alaska, is quoted at some length.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today the President has sent to the Congress his message on education, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], along with others of us, has joined in proposed legislation to bring about the objectives of the President in this matter.

While I am a cosponsor of the bill, that does not diminish my belief that the Federal Government should enter this field only in an emergency way, to help the States to build the schools which they need. I feel that much can be done within the States that has not been done, and I feel, further, that the Federal Government can be of assistance to the States by seeing to it that lands and properties are not removed from the tax rolls. This is a situation which has had the effect of causing the States to lose large sums of money, thereby creating not a small part of our school problem.

My staff has made a study of this matter covering a period of several months, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks several documents prepared by the staff, namely:

First. The Problem.

Second. Outline of All Proposals.

Third. Letter to Meyer Kestnbaum, chairman, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Fourth. Tabulation of Amounts in 1954.

Fifth. Staff Research Showing Changes.

Sixth. Properties Exempt in Arizona.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: We are enclosing herewith information which Mr. Donald Coover requested from Mr. Claude M. Hirst of this office by telephone today.

This contains a list of the properties which have been claimed by school districts in the State of Arizona under Public Laws 815 and 874 for the fiscal year 1954. We are giving the location of these properties, the number of acres and the estimated taxable value.

I hope this information will be useful to you. If there is any other way in which we can be of assistance to you please let us know.

Sincerely yours,
B. ALDEN LILLYWHITE,
Associate Director for Federally Affected Areas.

THE PROBLEM

We submit that there is no single, overall solution to the problem of education in the United States. Therefore, this means that several plans will have to be put into operation, both to meet the immediate needs of school construction and to handle the long-range problem of a growing population.

School financing is one phase of this gigantic problem, but it is a very important one. The major basis of financing education has been the property tax. However, since funds from this source have continued to be diverted to other uses, the income has declined. We do not deplore the other services which these funds have helped develop, but we do deplore the removal of property from tax rolls by the Federal Government, especially when that same property is used for commercial purposes.

An estimated total of more than 62 million acres of land is now being claimed by school districts for funds under Public Laws 815 and 874. The overall total of Federal land taken off the tax rolls of school districts would far exceed this. But this 62 million acres would return more than $307 billion to the school districts, if taxed at the average annual rate.

Therefore, it becomes increasingly obvious that Congress must take action to remedy this situation whereby commercially-used Federal properties escape taxes, while schools suffer for lack of a proper tax base.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is expected to release its report by June 1, and this problem of Federal-State relations is among many which will be considered. Congress should take positive action, bearing in mind the recommendations of the Commission and of previous hearings before Congress, which have been stalemated due to lack of adequate research on the matter.

Congress has several alternatives—direct tax payments, "in lieu" payments, direct payments or "in lieu" payments to the States which would then allocate the funds locally and continuation of Public Laws 815 and 874. Actually, these are more than alternatives, they are supplementary, since they may meet different problems in different areas. The choice of one should not eliminate the use of another.

Although this may solve the problem in just one-fourth of the federally-impacted school districts, long-range planning demands that commercially-used Federal property pay its full share of taxes—taxes that will be another step forward in meeting the educational demands imposed upon a Nation by a growing population.

COMPENSATION OF LOCAL TAXING AUTHORITIES FOR FEDERALLY OWNED LAND AND FOR OTHER FINANCIAL BURDENS IMPOSED BY THE FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

How can the Federal Government best meet its responsibility for compensating local taxing authorities, particularly in school districts where land has been removed from the local tax rolls by Federal acquisition and where other financial burdens are imposed by Federal activities.

Comment:

A. In the passage of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 Congress stated that it was

the policy of the Federal Government to compensate local educational agencies for burdens imposed on them by Federal activities in the manner and to the extent provided by these 2 acts.

B. If it is the policy to compensate local educational agencies for burdens imposed by Federal activity it could be generally agreed that the method proposed should produce the maximum local control in administering the compensation payments.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY PROPOSALS

A. Permit local taxing authorities to tax directly Federal property within its jurisdiction.

B. Provide for a payment in lieu of taxes to local public bodies on federally owned property within their jurisdiction.

C. Provide tax payments or payments in lieu of taxes to States for all Federal property in a State and authorize the State to allocate the funds to the local jurisdictions.

D. Continue Public Laws 874 and 815 in essentially the present form.

III. BACKGROUND FACTS

Current programs:

A. Public Laws 815 and 874 authorize payments for educational purposes only, not for other local governmental functions.

B. These acts place the Federal compensation generally in terms of:

1. Children living on nontaxable Federal property.

2. Children whose parents are employed on nontaxable Federal property.

3. Sudden and substantial impacts in school enrollments because of defense production.

C. The Federal payment is made to the school districts where the children live and attend school; not just those districts where the Federal property is located.

D. Payments in lieu of taxes for schools and other local services have been authorized for certain wartime constructed federally owned housing. Much of this housing is now being transferred from Federal ownership.

E. There are various other kinds of payments to local governmental units for federally owned land in connection with reclamation projects, forest lands, and game preserves.

F. These other Federal payments are deducted from entitlements of applicant districts under Public Law 874.

Experience under present legislation:

A. For the 1954 fiscal year there were 2,478 school districts eligible for assistance under Public Law 874 for payments on account of 849,271 children living on Federal property or living with a parent employed on Federal property.

1. There was federally owned property in 787 of these districts, or about one-third of the total.

2. These 787 districts had 502,000 children, or about three-fifths of the total claimed under section 3 of the act, but they received about four-fifths of the entitlements.

3. One thousand four hundred and thirteen districts, or two-thirds of the total, having no Federal property, received approximately one-fifth of the entitlement for about 40 percent of the children.

B. Applicants under Public Law 874 in the 1953 fiscal year claimed 2,034 separate Federal properties containing over 62 million acres with an estimated taxable value based on local rates of assessment at just under $20 billion.

1. Applicants claiming children living on Federal property or living with a parent employed on Federal property received that year $49,451,000 in Federal payments under the act.

2. This amounted to an average tax of 2.5 mills on the Federal property.

(a) The average tax on privately owned property paid for school purposes in the same districts was 15.6 mills. Had this tax rate been applied to the federally owned property it would have amounted to $307 million.

C. Various bills to provide payments by the Federal Government of taxes or in lieu payments on federally owned property have been introduced and considered in the past 10 years. Most of the bills that have been introduced restrict Federal payments to certain kinds of federally owned property or to property acquired within specified periods of time, or place other restrictions which greatly narrows the scope of the Federal payments.

D. Hearings were held by subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations in both the House and Senate last year on bills related to this problem.

1. The House Report No. 1217, lists four major reasons why uniform policies in this regard should be developed.

2. It further indicates that the executive departments opposed enactment of the bill and stated that these objections although meritorious do not in the judgment of the committee outweigh the hardships imposed on municipalities because of loss of revenue due to Federal activities.

E. The Senate Report No. 1966, indicates that meetings were held by the Subcommittee with the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations and with the Bureau of the Budget, and that various Federal agencies were asked for their comments on the proposed legislation.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations advised the committee that it did not deem it proper to comment on the legislation.

2. The Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies advised the committee that pending review of the forthcoming report and comments of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations no determination had been made with respect to the relationship of the proposed bill to the President's program. No action was taken by the Congress on these proposals.

IV. PROS AND CONS OF THE VARIOUS PROPOSALS

A. Direct taxes:

Pros:

1. A direct tax by the local taxing authority on federally owned property would be the most direct approach and the simplest to administer.

2. It would place the administration directly in the local governmental agency and remove any threat of Federal domination or interference.

3. It would permit districts to bond on the basis of this Federal property for schoolhouse construction.

Cons:

1. It makes no provision to take care of the impact caused by an increase in population due to Federal activities in those cases where these new families live and go to school in a different place from the one in which the Federal property is located.

2. It may encourage gerrymandering of school districts or other local jurisdictional boundaries.

3. It would increase the cost to the Federal Government for school purposes alone over the cost under Public Law 874 by 5 or 6 times.

B. Payments in lieu of taxes:

The same general advantages and disadvantages apply to this alternative as to alternative A except that:

1. It would be less direct in its administration, and school districts could not issue bonds against the Federal property.

2. There would be some possibility of holding down the cost to the Federal Government.

C. Tax payments or payments in lieu of taxes to State governments for allocation to local units.

Comment:

Under this proposal the Federal Government would pay to the States tax on federally owned property located within the State. The amount of such tax could be the average tax rate for school purposes in all school districts in the State applied to the value of all Federal property in the State, or the actual tax rate in the various school districts applied to the assessed value of the federally owned property in that school district. The States would then allocate funds to the communities on either of the following bases—

1. On basis of need as determined by State, or

2. On basis of Federal property located in each municipality, or

3. On the basis of the Federal impact as evidenced by federally owned land and increased population.

Pros:

1. This method could eliminate the difficulties inherent in a direct tax payment which goes only to those districts where Federal property is located, by allocating funds to districts experiencing severe increases in population because of Federal activities, but having no Federal property.

2. This method would probably eliminate the desire to gerrymander school-district boundaries in order to get a piece of the federally owned property.

3. It could result in a uniform tax rate on all Federal properties in a State and prevent imposition of excessive tax rates by some districts.

4. It would reduce the number of jurisdictions with which the Federal agency had to deal on a tax payment, or payment in lieu of taxes basis.

Cons:

1. It would remove administration of the program one step above the local government level.

2. It could result in reduction of State appropriations for various local purposes.

3. It is conceivable that the funds could be diverted from districts having Federal property and other federally caused burdens to other financially distressed districts.

4. It could result in encouraging Federal agencies to hold large tracts of land in order to get tax payments from the Federal Government. (This also would apply to the first three alternatives.)

D. Continue Public Laws 815 and 874 in essentially the same form as at present:

Pros:

1. Public Laws 815 and 874 distribute the Federal payment in such a manner as to meet the whole impact caused by Federal activities of school districts.

2. This method probably would cost the Federal Government less money than any of the other alternatives.

3. They are in existence and have operated successfully.

Cons:

1. They are extremely complicated pieces of legislation and difficult to understand.

2. They require direct Federal-local administration.

3. They contain some undesirable features primarily because of temporary extension.

JANUARY 27, 1955.

MEYER KESTNBAUM,

Chairman, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KESTNBAUM: It is my understanding that the Commission on Intergovern-

mental Relations, under your capable leadership, is currently studying the problem of the removal of properties from State, county, school, and local tax rolls by the Federal Government.

As you know, the removal of these properties from the tax rolls has resulted in a serious problem for many areas, including my own State of Arizona. In the case of schools, these areas are faced with a large and continually increasing student population, but with insufficient amounts of property remaining for providing revenue through property taxation.

It is my sincere hope, therefore, that the Commission, through its study groups, will arrive at some solution consistent with the highest aims of Federal-State relations, in which proper remuneration will be given the school districts through 1 or 2 methods. The two alternatives are "in lieu of property tax" payments to local communities or direct tax payments by the Federal agency or department administering the property or nongovernmental person or firm making use of such Federal property, as in the case of defense production facilities.

My research into this question indicates that such a move would solve the problem of school funds for more than one-fourth of the Federally-affected areas in the Nation. This would enable the local school district to retain full control of its own educational facilities, thereby halting the threat of Federally-controlled education. I personally prefer placing all commercially-used properties on the tax rolls, but I am amenable to the "in lieu" payments if you should judge this to be the better course.

In my State of Arizona alone, the latest available figures show that more than 29 million acres, with an estimated taxable valuation of more than $518 million, have been taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government. This includes defense facilities, Indian reservations, national parks, reclamation projects, and Federal office buildings. In the United States as a whole, property taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government is valued at nearly $20 billion and would yield more than $300 million in taxes.

I fully realize that certain safeguards must be provided in any legislation to make certain that the funds reach the school districts which are federally affected and that certain necessary Federal functions are not disturbed, as well as the fact that the Federal Government should not completely lose its immunities from local taxation in all cases. However, I firmly believe that all commercially used properties taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government should be placed back on these rolls.

As you know, several bills in this field of taxation have been introduced in previous Congresses, and progress on such legislation is now awaiting the results of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

I sincerely hope that the Commission's report will reaffirm the right of the local school district to govern itself and to tax properties within its district in order to provide the type of schooling that is so essential to the continuing growth of our Nation, without the hindrances imposed by a system of Federal tax immunity which has grown beyond all the bounds of its original scope.

My thanks to you for your consideration of this vital problem which so greatly affects us all.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

TABLE 10.—*Estimated amount eligible Federal property claimed by sec. 3 applicants would yield if taxable at average local rate, number and acreage of such properties, estimated taxable value, gross entitlements, and tax rates*

State	Eligible Federal properties claimed by applicant school districts		Estimated taxable value of Federal property based on local rates of assessment	Gross entitlements under subsecs. 3 (a) and 3 (b), Public Law 874, for 1953	Local tax (in mills) required on Federal property to equal Public Law 874 entitlement	Average local school tax in mills	Estimated amount Federal property would yield if taxable at average rate
	Number of properties	Number of acres					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama	45	551,957	$485,537,249	$562,051.03	1.2	8	$3,884,298
Alaska	31	742,383	609,388,395	322,574.22	.5	10	6,093,884
Arizona	41	11,126,299	418,961,707	447,493.71	1.1	19	7,960,272
Arkansas	26	1,667,179	263,936,748	375,190.80	1.4	20	5,278,735
California	327	9,266,915	1,582,339,595	11,640,989.29	7.4	12	18,988,075
Colorado	46	1,845,989	270,803,389	1,380,205.88	5.1	14	3,791,247
Connecticut	37	2,237	84,678,835	1,164,078.97	13.7	14	1,185,504
Delaware	1	417	1,142,152				
Florida	54	621,293	377,281,401	988,721.08	2.6	15	5,659,221
Georgia	47	681,118	599,262,184	1,021,670.92	1.7	14	8,389,671
Hawaii	35	51,556	487,204,303	958,170.56	2.0		
Idaho	25	4,760,817	84,031,149	269,750.91	3.2	23	1,932,716
Illinois	24	65,892	579,811,151	1,269,858.42	2.2	10	5,798,112
Indiana	23	199,902	630,238,605	684,121.28	1.1	18	11,344,295
Iowa	4	19,780	64,922,000	193,175.33	3.5	39	2,141,958
Kansas	28	128,096	597,753,450	2,472,609.47	4.1	12	7,173,041
Kentucky	29	456,958	479,116,543	905,388.78	1.9	14	6,707,632
Louisiana	15	713,614	147,849,750	165,343.41	1.1	10	1,478,498
Maine	31	19,130	136,107,310	345,640.73	2.5	27	3,674,897
Maryland	78	113,982	673,047,236	1,283,596.68	1.9	10	6,730,472
Massachusetts	24	43,518	428,057,223	591,639.68	1.4	16	6,848,916
Michigan	35	48,854	234,413,065	558,498.31	2.4	11	2,578,544
Minnesota	6	593,537	77,943,216	66,490.42	.9	6	467,659
Mississippi	16	12,998	56,815,228	330,881.27	5.8	17	965,859
Missouri	30	588,661	375,015,305	490,588.00	1.3	22	8,250,337
Montana	17	3,280,432	46,847,174	205,050.20	4.4	36	1,686,498
Nebraska	29	140,371	198,655,440	610,635.87	3.1	26	5,165,041
Nevada	15	4,173,652	126,770,792	457,520.31	3.6	7	887,396
New Hampshire	4	3,189	4,071,281	31,434.93 [1] (305,609.13)	7.7	26	105,853
New Jersey	40	73,388	332,215,590	893,781.66	2.7	37	12,291,977
New Mexico	17	3,135,148	145,956,281	299,312.34	2.1	7	1,021,694
New York	69	149,263	435,005,124	785,197.91	1.8	20	8,700,102
North Carolina	20	261,398	130,261,137	216,386.68	1.7	13	1,693,395
North Dakota	10	347,886	29,249,680	160,118.22	5.5	35	1,023,739
Ohio	61	56,944	395,596,248	1,809,285.79	4.6	11	4,351,559
Oklahoma	35	310,440	370,772,828	1,780,219.52	4.8	21	7,786,229
Oregon	27	2,996,561	447,964,892	363,290.74	.8	38	17,022,666
Pennsylvania	72	58,129	323,391,780	1,109,115.52	3.4	21	6,791,227
Rhode Island	12	5,822	122,273,804	497,901.00	4.1	11	1,345,012
South Carolina	31	230,363	1,227,261,425	827,293.48	.7	28	34,363,320
South Dakota	19	368,542	59,607,633	453,273.01	7.6	31	1,847,837
Tennessee	28	141,985	792,680,400	334,254.78	.4	14	11,097,526
Texas	133	2,578,157	1,699,139,312	3,269,985.40	1.9	8	13,593,114
Utah	22	2,327,494	314,718,339	567,719.56	1.8	16	5,035,493
Vermont	6	12,729	9,776,320	49,558.82	5.1	28	273,737
Virginia	97	314,245	1,268,092,299	4,109,523.15	3.2	18	22,825,661
Washington	140	4,940,331	1,299,240,468	1,576,293.12	1.2	14	18,189,367
West Virginia	3	821	39,100,000	27,841.33	.7	16	625,600
Wisconsin	5	68,028	142,146,000	218,888.98	1.5	14	1,990,044
Wyoming	22	1,957,263	31,194,044	3,042.54	.1	10	311,940
Total	2,034	62,255,663	19,727,645,480	49,451,253.14	2.5	15.6	307,349,870

[1] Represents entitlements paid New Hampshire claimants under Public Law 11 (83d Cong.) for children living in New Hampshire but connected with property in Maine. Excluded from calculation of tax required.

ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF ELIGIBLE FEDERAL PROPERTY CLAIMED BY SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 874 APPLICANTS WOULD YIELD IF TAXABLE AT AVERAGE LOCAL RATE, NUMBER AND ACREAGE OF SUCH PROPERTIES, ESTIMATED TAXABLE VALUE, GROSS ENTITLEMENTS, AND TAX RATES

Latest figures for the United States, according to my research.

Two thousand seven hundred and six properties, compared to two thousand and thirty-four for the previous annual report of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One hundred and five million six hundred twenty-two thousand and sixty-four total acres, compared to sixty-two million two hundred fifty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-three for the previous report.

An estimated taxable value of $22,492,761,859 based on local rates of assessment, compared to $19,727,645,480 in the previous report.

A local tax of 2.9 mills required on Federal property to equal Public Law 874 entitlement, compared to 2.5 mills in the previous report.

An average local school tax of 15.6 mills, compared to 15.6 mills previously.

This property would bring an estimated $348,165,504 if taxed at the average rate, compared to $307,349,870 in the previous report.

For my State of Arizona the totals are:

Sixty-nine properties, compared to forty-one previously.

Twenty-nine million two hundred thirty-one thousand one hundred and thirty-five acres, compared to eleven million one hundred twenty-six thousand two hundred and ninety-nine.

An estimated taxable value of $508,317,047 based on local rates of assessment, compared to $418,961,707.

A gross entitlement under subsections 3a and 3b of Public Law 874 for 1954 of $528,455.52, compared to $447,493.71 for 1953.

A local tax of 1 mill required on Federal property to equal Public Law 874 entitlement, compared to 1.1.

An average local school tax of 19 mills, compared to 19 mills.

This property would bring an estimated $9,658,024 if taxed at the average rate, compared to $7,960,272 previously.

Information regarding federally owned property in the State of Arizona located in or near school districts that are applicants under Public Laws 874 and 815 during the 1954 fiscal year

Name of property	Location	Number of acres	Estimated taxable value
All American Canal, Gila project	Yuma	19,300	(1)
Apache National Forest	Springerville	677,823	$10,272,522
Avondale Circle No. 2038, No. 2355, PHA.	Avondale	(2)	133,392
Border patrol station	Tucson	(2)	10,000
Camp Verde Indian Reservation	Camp Verde	476	6,525
Casa Grande National Monument	Coolidge	473	226,362
Catalina Federal Prison Camp	Tucson	20	230,060
Coconino National Forest	Coconino and Yavapai Counties.	1,830,470	12,813,290
Colorado River Indian Reservation	Parker	204,800	35,000,000
Consolidated dwellings No. 2027, PHA.	Tucson	(2)	107,855
Coronado National Forest	Pima and Pinal Counties.	1,982,721	220,000
Courthouse	Phoenix	(2)	500,000
Customhouse	Yuma	1	10,050
Davis Dam project	Bullhead City	1,000	24,825,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	Tucson	6,575	20,000,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Wherry Housing No. 123-80000-80007.	do	89	5,001,770
Davis-Monthan Dwellings No. 2025	do	21	46,415
Fort Apache Indian Reservation	White River	1,664,872	11,654,104
Fort Huachuca	Fort Huachuca	33,713	10,000,000
Gila project (Wellton-Mohawk division).	Wellton	115,000	575,000
Gila River Indian Reservation	Sacaton	372,022	2,526,000
Grand Canyon National Park	Grand Canyon	604,809	650,000
Grand Central Electronics Bldg	Tucson	1	100,000
Hopi Indian Reservation	Mesa	631,291	5,000,000
Hualapai Indian Reservation	Yavapai County	997,045	837,305
Hughes Aircraft Co. plant	Tucson	2,560	2,952,205
Indian Hospital	do	1,280	1,024,000
Indian Irrigation Service	Coolidge	400	11,770
Indian school and hospital	Phoenix	476	2,200,000
Ingalls Victory Homes No. 2338	Yuma	(2)	27,573
Katherine Wash ranger station	Katherine	160	50,500
Luke Air Force Base	Phoenix	384	12,946,000
Mesa Vista Homes No. 2063, No. 2337, PHA.	Yuma	20	108,084
Mesa Vista Homes Annex 2-D-1	do	6	(1)
One Forty West Monroe Bldg	Phoenix	(2)	73,575
Navaho Indian Reservation	Window Rock	10,812,884	$75,690,188
Navaho Homes, Inc., No. 123-80006, FHA.	Flagstaff	35	(1)
Navaho Ordnance Depot	do	28,426	10,536,000
Naval Air Facility	Phoenix	658	15,035,000
Naval and Marine Corps Training Center.	Tucson	(2)	14,387
Neighbors Village 1-D-1, 1-D-2	Yuma	18	(1)
Padre Garces Homes	do	(2)	15,322
Papago Indian Reservation	Pima County	2,855,920	1,750,000
Parker Dam power project	Mesa	13	2,545,580
Petrified Forest National Monument	Holbrook	85,303	(1)
Pima Indian Reservation	Chandler	31,000	1,175,000
Pinel District ranger station	Globe	4	5,000
Post office	Phoenix	(2)	500,000
Post office and courthouse	Tucson	(2)	200,000
Post office	Yuma	(2)	167,521
Reclamation substation	Coolidge	40	2,509,750
Reclamation houses	Yuma	(2)	83,125
Reclamation substation	Tucson	(2)	10,000,000
Rincon Vista	do	22	800,000
Salt River Valley project	Phoenix	(2)	200,000,000
San Xavier Indian Reservation	Tucson	29,352	205,464
Sitgreaves National Forest	Holbrook	808,237	5,657,659
Sky Harbor Airport	Phoenix	(2)	2,000,009
Tonto National Forest	Mesa, Maricopa Counties.	2,410,508	1,071,800
Veterans' Administration Hospital	Phoenix	27	2,040,000
Veterans' Administration Center	Prescott	(2)	500,000
Veterans' Administration Hospital	Tucson	(2)	2,000,000
Wenden manganese purchasing depot	Wenden	142	187,000
Whipple Barracks	Prescott	60	(1)
Williams Air Force Base	Chandler	2,114,614	13,386,394
Williams Air Force Base Housing No. 123-80001, 2, 3, 4, 5.	do	(2)	1,102,500
Yuma County Airport	Yuma	(2)	4,000,000
Yuma Test Station	do	906,064	5,000,000
Total		29,231,135	518,317,047

[1] Taxable value unknown.

[2] Number of acres unknown.

MONOPOLIES AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of Friday, February 4, 1955. I make this request because it shows that the Government has paid billions of dollars in subsidies, approximately $16 billion since 1940 in connection with research, and that farm price supports in the same period have cost only a little more than $1 billion.

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

When President Eisenhower cancelled out the Northwest Airline's permit to fly to the Orient and to Hawaii, he put the spotlight on some things that have not generally been publicized. Monopolies and subsidies. The big airlines, for the most part, get substantial subsidies from Uncle Sam, and in many instances, it is important that they do as a means of improving airline service and national defense. But at the same time, there seems a definite trend toward a few big airlines monopolizing the business. Getting the best runs, best routes, into their hands (with Government approval, business is made in Washington, as well as prices).

It's the big squeeze. The biggest firms do the squeezing, and the little ones get the squeeze. According to newspapers, subsidies are increasing for the airlines which the President said would get the right to fly the Pacific air routes. And, oddly enough, Northwest Airlines, which lost out by Presidential order, says it would make these runs without Government subsidy, according to the newspapers.

Now what confounds us is not so much as to who is right or wrong, or what subsidies should be paid. What bothers us is that so many people and some editors keep complaining that farmers get subsidies, but hardly a word is said about the out-and-out helping hand payments to other businesses from the Federal Treasury.

And when subsidies are necessary, they perform a good service. We don't quarrel with that idea. We just say subsidies should be judged by how much good they do, or don't do. You've heard a great deal of ballyhoo over TV and radio, and in the press, about how industrial research has improved your living standards and material welfare. It has. But who pays for it? The industries? They do pay for part of it, but only about half. You, the taxpayers, pay the rest of the research bill. And all to our mutual good.

This is what Newsweek magazine says about subsidies for industrial research: "The United States Government, these days, supports about half of all the Nation's research and development. The President's budget request for science for the fiscal year starting July 1 * * * totals $2,218,000,000." Of course, a lot of that is spent to develop new airplanes, guns, tanks, etc. But then the blueprints are turned over to industry along with profitable contracts for manufacture.

Since 1940, some $30 billion has been spent on scientific and engineering research in industry. The Federal Government has paid more than half of that. The taxpayers have put up about $16 billion. Yet, you hear little about this huge subsidy, and you hear a lot about the much smaller sum spent on supporting prices on basic farm crops at 90 percent of parity.

Let's compare the costs of these two programs to the Government, industrial research on the one hand, farm price supports on the other. We've already said that the Government has subsidized research to the tune of $16 billion since 1940. Farm price supports in that same period have cost only a little more than $1 billion. Sixteen billions for industrial research, one billion for farm price supports.

Don't think that we are complaining about the money spent on research. We aren't. It was money well spent for a good purpose. But we think the farm price-support money was also well spent. We don't like to see farmers raked over the coals by press, radio, and high Government officials just because they got one-sixteenth of the financial help that industry got for research alone.

Certainly a healthy agriculture, producing abundantly, is as important to the Nation as new and better machines of war and peace. This is GTA, the co-op way.

PROBLEMS OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Lynn Springer, of Wyndmere, N. Dak., which I ask to have printed in full, together with a copy of a letter from Lloyd A. Opperud, of Oppy's Hatchery & Produce. I wish to read one paragraph of his letter:

Prices at the farm today all over the great Central States on poultry and eggs are so far below cost of production and, in fact, are at ruinous levels as far as the farmer is concerned. Values at the farm are below the disaster level. They are, comparatively speaking, even lower than the depression prices of 1932 and apparently no more is being done about it today than was at that time. In my 15 years in this great industry I have never seen conditions worse for the poultry and egg farmer than they are today. Markets on medium size and small eggs are especially depressed at this time due to seasonal heavy production of these grades.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the other letter to which I referred.

There being no objection, the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYNDMERE, N. DAK., *November 9, 1954.*
Senator LANGER.

DEAR SIR: Am sending you a copy of letter put out by our hatchery and produce man. The situation is very serious. Couldn't something be done about this? It has always been that when action was needed, you always do your best. So am hoping for a betterment in the poultry industry of this Midwest.

Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. LYNN SPRINGER.

WYNDMERE, N. DAK., *October 21, 1954.*
Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: I am writing you about the serious plight of the poultry and egg farmer in the Midwest.

Prices at the farm today all over the great Central States on poultry and eggs are so far below cost of production and, in fact, are at ruinous levels as far as the farmer is concerned. Values at the farm are below the disaster level. They are, comparatively speaking, even lower than the depression prices of 1932 and apparently no more is being done about it today than was at that time. In my 15 years in this great industry I have never seen conditions worse for the poultry and egg farmer than they are today. Markets on medium-size and small eggs are especially depressed at this time due to seasonal heavy production of these grades.

It is my suggestion these fine quality medium-size eggs to be purchased for school lunches during the season they are in such heavy supply. In addition we suggest the Army pay for mediums on the basis of their true value instead of the unjust differentials they are now using. For example grade A mediums weigh only 5 pounds per case less than grade A large. It is obvious at present levels this grade based on the actual is worth within 5 cents per dozen of large eggs. Yet the Army is paying currently 20 cents per dozen less for mediums than for large eggs.

This means the farmer is receiving $4.50 per case less than actual worth for these eggs. I consider it very unjust that a department of our Government would take advantage of our farmers in this way.

Prices on hens in the Midwest today range from 8 to 10 cents per pound. These prices are ridiculous. A large percentage of the hens sold move to market during October and November or when the farmer is making room for his new crop of layers.

I suggest Government purchases of dressed fowl during this period to eliminate the glut on the market. This fowl to be stored and sold in the season to stabilize prices.

The Midwest poultry and egg farmer feels he is the forgotten man in agriculture. Action is needed not next month or next year, but today. It is my candid opinion that if proper action had been taken just a few months ago this deplorable condition would not now exist.

No one expects a handout but if business can be protected by tariffs and subsidies, labor by a guaranteed minimum wage, surely the poultry and egg farmer is entitled to some consideration in his present serious situation.

Yours truly,
OPPY'S HATCHERY AND PRODUCE,
LLOYD A. OPPERUD.

OBJECTIONS TO APPEARANCE BEFORE CONGRESS OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last Friday I appeared before the Judiciary Committee and filed written objections to the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to appear before a joint session of the Congress. The press did not print my objections in full. Therefore, I wish to read them into the RECORD. I said at that time:

I appear before the subcommittee in opposition to this resolution.

The reasons are three:

First, during the 2 years that the present Chief Justice has been occupying that office, he has never once either asked to appear before the Judiciary Committee with any recommendations to improve the legal machinery of this country; nor has he sent any recommendations personally to that effect.

Secondly, to me this resolution smacks again of British internationalism and the aping of British custom by our American Government. The argument has been made that we should follow the British custom of having members of the Cabinet appear before joint sessions of Congress just as British ministers appear before Houses of Parliament.

However, I call your attention to the fact that in Great Britain they have no committees such as we have under our American procedure. In other words, in Great Britain, there is no judiciary committee to which the head of any judicial system could go and he, therefore, goes directly to Parliament.

In the United States, however, we have committees covering practically every important subject and even if the Chief Justice appeared before the joint session of Congress, whatever the recommendations might be, they in turn would be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee or the House Judiciary Committee, or both.

It is therefore absurd to take the time of this Congress to listen to a speech on the part of either a member of the Cabinet, or the Chief Justice, when everything that he says will have to be referred to a committee anyway and would simply be a waste of time.

My third objection is that it sets a precedent which will likely result in members of the Cabinet sooner or later requesting the opportunity to be heard; with the result that we would not only have members of the Cabinet, but heads of the various departments asking to appear before joint sessions. As I said before, the proper way to handle the matter under our American system of government is to go directly to the appropriate committees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated January 18, 1955, and signed by John Marshall, addressed to the editor and published in the New York Times under the headline, "Selecting Federal Judges—Factors in Filling Vacancies in Judiciary Are Discussed."

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

SELECTING FEDERAL JUDGES—FACTORS IN FILLING VACANCIES IN JUDICIARY ARE DISCUSSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I was interested in reading the article by Arthur Krock on the plan proposed by one of my successors in Justice to put the Chief Justice before Congress. I note that John W. Davis favors the plan, which ordinarily would give me pause, but I am constrained to offer a mild dissent.

In my humble opinion it would be better if the Chief Justice and Associate Justices would make fewer speeches and engage in fewer extracurricular activities. The television recently portrayed the Chief Justice leading a parade, and the papers here carried accounts of his participation in a dinner here awarding citations for prominent athletes.

Other Justices have written and spoken on their mountain-climbing achievements, presided at trials outside the country, and generally participated in many activities outside the law.

My view is that the best thing for the judiciary and the country would be the selection of better judges. The appointment of an inexperienced lawyer as a judge inevitably leads to a crowded docket.

It is fair to say that in recent years the advice of politicians rather than lawyers has been controlling in the selection of Federal judges. Mr. Davis and I were admitted to practice in the Federal Court of West Virginia by a judge who had been appointed by Lincoln and had served 50 years before his retirement. This is one illustration of the importance of getting the best possible man for this service.

One recent administration appointed a score of lame-duck Congressmen. In another the woman head of a national committee here proudly boasted in the press that she was responsible for a judicial appointment.

I can only speak of the administration of President Coolidge. Neither President Coolidge nor his Attorney General consulted the heads of the national committee but rather the Chief Justice, senior circuit judges, and bar associations. There is a popular misconception that because Senators have to confirm, they nominate the Federal judges. This was not true in President Coolidge's administration.

I know that there are presently committees of the American Bar Association and State and local bar associations which continue to make recommendations. It may well be that it is their fault that the recommendations go unheeded.

It is my opinion that the most logical field from which to select members of the Supreme Court is the Circuit Court of Appeals. It is unfortunate that great judges like Learned Hand, Orie Phillips, and Harold Stevens, just to name a few, have been passed over.

JOHN MARSHALL.

NEW YORK, *January 18, 1955.*

PUBLIC LAW 664—CARGO PREFERENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the closing days of the 83d Congress legislation was enacted to broaden and make permanent certain existing cargo-preference guaranties to the American merchant marine.

Public Law 664, signed by President Eisenhower on August 26, 1954, affirms a national policy, which had previously been proclaimed time and again by the Congress, of assuring to privately owned United States-flag merchant vessels of at least 50 percent of all oceanborne cargoes purchased for, or given away by, or financed by the Federal Government.

The policy thus incorporated into permanent legislation previously had been laid down in the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920, 1928, and 1936, and again in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. The substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce which these acts called for as necessary to maintenance of an adequate, privately owned merchant fleet,

was made more specific in various military and foreign economic provisions of the past half century.

As far back as 1904 Congress legislated to require that "vessels of the United States and no others" were to be employed in the transportation by sea of coal, provisions, fodder, or supplies of any description, purchased pursuant to law, for the use of the Army or Navy.

Again, in 1934, Public Resolution 17, 73d Congress, required that all cargoes financed by the Export-Import Bank or any other instrumentality of Government should be carried in American bottoms. This resolution still is effective.

In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the ECA Amendments of 1949, the principle of "at least 50 percent" was adopted, and this interpretation of the policy of "substantial portion" was continued in the Korean Aid Act—Public Law 447, 81st Congress—and in all emergency aid and assistance acts since that time, as well as in the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

In all these enactments, it was provided that the 50-percent guaranty should apply only to the extent that such vessels were available at market rates. That same safeguard was included in Public Law 664.

Why is such a guaranty necessary? Why, from earliest time, has it been felt necessary to take specific measures to assure continued existence and operation of an adequate, privately owned merchant fleet? The reasons, basically, are quite simple.

As a maritime nation, America's progress and prosperity have always been possible only to the extent that shipping has been available to carry its products to foreign shores, and bring back the raw materials lacking here.

Furthermore, as a nation open to attack by water on more than half of its borders, and, more recently, because of the urgent shipping needs of our military forces in action, or in constant danger in stations in many parts of the world, certain facts regarding ocean transportation have become inescapable.

First. Peacetime needs require a merchant fleet capable of carrying our foreign commerce. Otherwise, our economy is at the mercy of foreign shipping, as bitter experience has proven.

Second. World Wars I and II, and the Korean hostilities, have given indisputable evidence that America's Military Establishment, or its defensive setup, cannot operate without a vast auxiliary of merchant shipping. We suffered in World War I, and the free nations were in extreme danger in World War II, because there was not adequate shipping available. Actually, it was not until the spring of 1945 that our Military Establishment could plan its strategic moves with entire confidence that sufficient shipping would be available. It is no secret that World War II was prolonged needlessly, with resulting additional losses in men and in national wealth, because our merchant marine was not nearly adequate to war's requirements.

With all this a matter of record, the third fact then becomes equally clear: namely, that United States-flag vessels cannot compete in the world transportation field—it cannot survive—without some aid from Government. Wages, supplies, safety requirements, all stemming from America's higher standard of living, give the low-cost foreign vessels an insurmountable advantage over American ships.

So we come to the nub of the problem—how best to aid American-flag vessels to meet this competition. Some have suggested that we entrust our commerce, and our national security, to the low-cost foreign vessels and stop worrying about how to meet their competition. But one does not hear any such suggestions from informed sources—such as military leaders who have to meet logistic requirements throughout the world, and industrial leaders who must depend upon the United States merchant fleet.

The military leaders have the experience of World War II and Korea fresh in their minds. Industry remembers its experience of years gone by. It remembers when ocean freight rates jumped as much as 2,000 percent, and when American cargoes rotted on docks everywhere because the foreign shipping on which reliance had been placed was nonexistent, or was too busy taking care of their own nations' need to bother about American commerce.

When it comes to a question of how to aid American-flag vessels, there can be only one truly sensible answer.

That answer is—cargoes. Shipping lives, and prospers, by the cargoes it carries. Deprived of those cargoes, as much of America's shipping has been lately, in the face of vastly increased foreign competition, shipping cannot survive. It was to fill this breach—which always will exist except in time of emergency—that the cargo-preference, or 50–50 policy, was devised. American shipping does not want handouts from the Government. It wants to earn its way, in the one manner that justifies the existence of shipping anywhere; namely, by carrying cargoes. And certainly it is not too much to ask that cargoes for our own needs, those which we give away, and those which we finance in one way or another, be divided equally as between our own shipping and that of other nations.

Opposed to the school of thought which would entrust our commerce to ships of foreign nations on a false "economy" basis, is another school which maintains that we should demand not 50 percent, but 100 percent of Government aid or financed cargoes, for our own flag vessels.

They point out that even with this 50–50 division, American-flag vessels have been carrying less—sometimes far less—than a third of our foreign commerce. On the other hand, foreign shipping is in better health than at any time since World War II.

As a matter of fact, Public Law 664, as originally conceived, provided for 100 percent carriage of Government-owned or financed cargoes in American-flag vessels. Mainly because of the adverse effect which such action might have on our allies abroad, I refused to support those demands. But, as between the two schools of thought, as between the policy of guaranteeing our own ships no part of those ocean cargoes paid for or financed by Government, or of guaranteeing them 100 percent of such cargoes, I could have no hesitancy in taking a stand. I would be with those who urge 100 percent. But it is fortunate, indeed, that no such choice is necessary. Common sense will always require that we do not place reliance on foreign shipping, but, rather, that we take such reasonable measure as will protect our merchant fleet from disappearing from the seas.

It has come to my attention that the Department of Agriculture, which stated that it had no immediate interest in this 50–50 bill when it was before the Senate for consideration, now is having trouble finding space on American vessels for transportation of surplus agricultural products.

If that be a fact, certainly there is no reason to attach any blame to the cargo-preference bill. Rather, there should be genuine satisfaction over the improved, but still far from healthy, state of the American merchant marine, which this bill has certainly helped to accomplish. How much better it is to have our shipping generally busy, rather than rotting at the wharves, as was the case a few months ago before this bill became effective.

My information, however, is that competitive bids have been submitted by American ship operators on every occasion when the Department of Agriculture has asked for bids. Moreover—and this is most important—I am told that American-flag tramp-vessel quotations as of the present time are 20 cents per ton less than even our National Shipping Authority rates.

Rates on United States-flag berth liners, of course, are identical with those of competing foreign vessels. I suggest that the Department of Agriculture may resolve these transportation difficulties by seeking a greater number of competitive bids from American shipping.

It should be kept in mind that Public Law 664 foresaw just such a situation as is now reported—and provided for it. The law makes application of the 50–50 provisions dependent upon the condition that American vessels are "available at fair and reasonable rates for United States-flag commercial vessels." If privately owned United States-flag vessels are not so available, there is no requirement in the law that such vessels be used for the transportation of these surplus agricultural commodities.

Another point to be kept in mind, however, is the desirability of maintaining our tramp fleet in an active, prosperous condition. Anyone familiar with ocean shipping history can recall the numerous instances when American exporters have been forced to pay outrageous rates for space on foreign ships because no privately owned American-flag vessels were available.

Public Law 664, with its assurance of 50 percent of Government-purchased or Government-financed cargoes to United States-flag vessels, is a reasonable measure.

Even under it, our shipping will still be far from the goal, as fixed in the basic merchant marine legislation, of carrying

what might reasonably be considered a "substantial portion" of our country's waterborne export and import foreign commerce. Even under this "50–50" law, our ships will not be carrying the 50 percent of all our commerce which can rightfully be claimed as their due.

At least, however, Public Law 664 will help the American merchant marine meet to some extent the terrific competition of foreign shipping operating at one-fourth to one-half of the cost of American-flag vessels. On a realistic basis, this looks like as much as we can hope for. But it is as little as we can afford to take, in the interest of American prosperity and national security.

I will oppose to the utmost any efforts to deprive American shipping of the relatively feeble aid it now enjoys as a result of the operation of Public Law 664.

TAX AVOIDANCE IN CONNECTION WITH POLITICAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on August 4, 1953, Mr. Welburn Mayock, an attorney in Washington, D. C., was testifying before the Kean subcommittee. At that time the Kean committee was investigating the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue. In his testimony of that date Mr. Mayock explained how in 1948, while serving as the chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, he had entered into an agreement with Mr. William S. Lasdon, Katonah, N. Y., whereby he was to obtain for Mr. Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case. In return for obtaining this favorable ruling, which would save nearly $7 million for Mr. Lasdon, Mr. Mayock was to receive a $65,000 cash fee, with the understanding that $30,000 of this amount was to go to the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer, but solely in his capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, then contacted Mr. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of Treasury, and promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question.

Mr. Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable decision upon this same question by the Treasury Department.

After this tax-fix scheme had been arranged, and after Mr. Mayock had collected his $65,000 fee, he was confronted with the problem of how to get the $30,000 into the Democratic campaign fund without obviously violating the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act prohibits contributions to a political campaign in excess of $5,000 by any one individual. However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for $65,000, the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates.

Accordingly, as Mr. Mayock explained it, he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee, in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash. In this manner he siphoned this $30,000 of hot money into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee.

While freely admitting all of the above transactions during his testimony before the Kean subcommittee under date of August 4, 1953, Mr. Mayock flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political campaign. Each time the committee pressed him for the names of these individuals, Mr. Mayock replied, "That I am going to refuse to answer."

Since Mr. Mayock was reluctant to publish the names of the individuals who exchanged their personal checks, payable to the national committee, for an equivalent amount of this "tax-fix fee," I shall read that list to the Senate, along with a breakdown of the amount handled by each individual, plus the dates of the transactions.

Date	Name and address	Amount
Oct. 13, 1948	Democratic County Central Committee, William H. Malone, chairman, 955 Mills Tower, San Francisco	$10,000
Oct. 14, 1948	Harold A. Berliner, 10 Crown Terrace, San Francisco	5,000
Do	William J. Mahaney, 2412 Russ Bldg., San Francisco	5,000
Oct. 18, 1948	Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill St., Los Angeles	2,500
Do	Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Ave., Los Angeles	2,500
Do	William B. Peeler, 7133 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood	2,500
Do	Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Ave., Hollywood	2,500
	Total	30,000

This was not the only time that the Treasury Department, under the New Deal administration, resorted to the issuance of questionable rulings for the purpose of financing the 1948 political campaign.

On April 29, 1952, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of a series of political rulings which had been issued by the Treasury Department while Mr. John W. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury, wherein Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Mr. Marshall Field, and Mr. David A. Schulte, both of New York City, were permitted to charge off as "bad business debts" their approximately $400,000 contributions to the 1948 Democratic campaign. Since incorporating those rulings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have discovered that the same Mr. Welburn Mayock was one of the prime factors behind those rulings.

On December 27, 1948, Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent Mr. Reynolds or the others involved, but solely in his official capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, held a conference with Mr. Edward H. Foley, Undersecretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Thomas J. Lynch, General Counsel of the Treasury Department. At that meeting they discussed the Richard W. Reynolds case, which involved a $300,000 contribution to the Democratic Party, as a party case, and arranged for the issuance of a favorable ruling allowing him to write off this contribution as a bad business loan.

As further evidence of the callousness of the political regime then in power, we find that the Treasury Department even permitted Mr. Mayock to get away with reporting on his 1948 Federal income-tax returns only $17,500 of this $65,000 fee collected from Mr. Lasdon. Before computing his taxes he was permitted to deduct from the fee the $30,000 which he set aside for the Democratic National Committee. He deducted from the gross fee another $17,500 solely upon his claim that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon, 275 Central Park West, New York City, and Mr. Louis Markus, 9445 86th Road, Woodhaven, Long Island, as their share of the tax-fix payoff.

This latter deduction was allowed, notwithstanding the fact that when both Mr. Markus and Mr. Solomon testified under oath August 5, 1953, before the Kean subcommittee, they emphatically denied that they had received any of this fee, and accordingly they had paid no taxes on their alleged share.

But the mere fact that no one was paying any tax on the $17,500 in controversy did not in the least bother the Treasury Department. They merely placed it in the same category as the $30,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee and allowed everyone to write it off in his tax returns.

This procedure of issuing favorable Treasury rulings in exchange for contributions to a political party was extremely costly to the American taxpayers from two angles:

First. The granting of these favorable rulings which apparently would not otherwise have been extended resulted in a substantial loss in revenue.

Second. The issuance of these rulings had the indirect effect of financing a part of the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

The disclosure of these transactions was a shock to the American people, and the overwhelming majority of the members of the Democratic Party were just as indignant as were the members of the Republican Party to find that certain high officials in that administration had stooped to such low tactics for the purpose of financing a political campaign.

Even after publication of the additional list of names of those involved in this deal there are still many questions left unanswered in this case, and I suggest that both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department reexamine the conflicting testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in August 1953.

For example, the conflict of testimony wherein Mr. Mayock under oath told the committee that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon and Mr. Louis Marcus and their testimony of the following day emphatically denying this statement obviously is the basis of a perjury charge.

The statute of limitations may have expired on violations of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1948, but it has not expired on any possible perjury charges resulting from testimony given before

the Kean subcommittee in 1953, nor has it expired upon the ability of the Treasury Department to collect back taxes due on the erroneous deduction of the $30,000 fee to the Democratic National Committee as well as the controversial $17,500 previously referred to.

Grand juries are now in session at both Omaha and St. Louis, and their work should shed additional light upon the scandal-ridden Tax Bureau of that era.

The San Francisco News of February 8, 1955, reported a statement of two of the individuals involved, Mr. William Malone and Mr. Harold Berliner, outlining their version of the transaction, and in the Los Angeles Times of February 9, 1955, others mentioned in that area explained their position.

I think the explanation of the entire group can best be summed by the statement of Mr. William R. Peeler, of Hollywood, and one of the participants, who said:

The attorney who handled the contributions out here just came around to the office where we worked and asked several of us if he could use our names in making the donation.

I asked him if using my name would carry any financial, moral, or legal responsibility.

He said "No." He said "it was just a way of getting around a law that neither party paid any attention to anyway".

Unquestionably this shady transaction from the beginning was recognized as a violation of the law by all concerned, and it should be noted that the only reason criminal prosecution was not invoked was that it was kept covered up by the preceding administration until the statute of limitations had expired.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD the statements of these individuals as appearing in the San Francisco News of February 8, 1955, and in the Los Angeles Times of February 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco News of February 8, 1955]

TWO SAN FRANCISCO DEMS DEFEND ROLES IN MONEY SHIFT

Two of the three San Franciscans named by United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS today warmly defended their participation in a Democratic money transfer described by the Delaware Republican.

William M. Malone, former chairman of the Democratic County Committee, reserved comment until he could read WILLIAMS' complete statement on the $10,000 check which Malone, in that capacity, sent to the Democratic National Committee in 1948.

The other two—Harold A. Berliner, former Internal Revenue Service collector here, and William J. Mahaney, attorney—freely discussed their forwarding of $5000 each to the national committee.

"I had never heard of Mayock (former chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, who arranged the fund transfers) and didn't know he was in the picture," said Berliner.

"I was told by our county chairman that some money had come into our committee, and was asked, with Mr. Mahaney, if I would send this money in my name to the national committee as a contribution. So I did.

"People frequently make contributions to committees, and want it sent in to the national committee without having their names used. It was an absolutely clean transaction.

Mahaney, too, said he never had heard of Mayock at the time.

"The amounts that came to Berliner and me came from Malone," he said.

"I didn't know anything about the background, but it was not unusual to have the head of the organization here put money in through you, and hand you the money to make a contribution—or have you hand him some.

"That was the beginning and end of the whole transaction."

Mahaney added that the matter "already has been investigated very thoroughly."

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 9, 1955]

ANGELENOS NAMED IN TAX DONATION—SENATOR SAYS 7 CALIFORNIANS HELPED CHANNEL $30,000 FEE TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, today named 7 Californians who, he said, had participated in channeling $30,000 of a lawyer's fee to fix a tax case into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee in 1948.

WILLIAMS said he was listing the names since Welburn Mayock, Washington, D. C., lawyer involved in the case, had refused to do so in testimony August 4, 1953, before a House subcommittee investigating the Internal Revenue Bureau.

CALIFORNIANS NAMED

The Californians named by WILLIAMS in a Senate speech were William H. Malone, San Francisco; Harold A. Berliner, San Francisco; William J. Mahaney, San Francisco; Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill Street, Los Angeles; Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Avenue, Los Angeles; William R. Peeler, 5107 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood; and Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Avenue, Hollywood.

WILLIAMS said Mayock collected a $65,000 cash fee in the tax case, with the understanding that $30,000 of it was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

"But," said WILLIAMS, "the lawyer was confronted with the problem of how to get the $30,000 into the Democratic campaign funds without violating the Hatch Act ban on individual contributions in excess of $5,000."

METHOD EXPLAINED

"As Mr. Mayock explained it" in his testimony, WILLIAMS said, "he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash."

"In this manner," the Senator added, "he siphoned this $30,000 of hot money into the treasury of the Democratic Committee."

WILLIAMS said that Mayock freely admitted these transactions in testifying before the House investigators but that he flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political compaign.

At the top of a list of transactions read by WILLIAMS was an item of Democratic County Central Committee, Willian H. Malone, chairman, San Francisco. The amount given was $10,000 and the date October 13, 1948.

He listed $5,000 each for Berliner and Mahaney, both on October 14, and $2,500 each for Owens, Willis Allen, Peeler, and Lawrence Allen, all on October 18, 1948.

WILLIAMS said testimony before the House subcommittee showed that Mayock, while serving as chief council of the Democratic National Committee in 1948, had entered into an agreement with William S. Lasdon, of Katonah, N. Y., "whereby he was to obtain for Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case."

"In return for obtaining this favorable ruling which would save nearly $7 million for Mr. Lasdon," WILLIAMS said, Mayock was to receive a $65,000 cash fee with the understanding that $30,000 was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

RULING CLAIMED

WILLIAMS said that Mayock, "without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer but solely in his capacity as chief counsel" of the national committee, then contacted John W. Snyder, who was Secretary of the Treasury, and "promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question."

WILLIAMS said Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable ruling on "this same question" by the Treasury Department.

After commenting on Mayock's problem of turning the $30,000 over to the national committee, WILLIAMS said:

"However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for $65,000 the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates."

In San Francisco, both Berliner and Mahaney readily confirmed they each sent in $5,000. Both said they did so at Malone's request, did not ask where the money came from and considered it a routine action, innocent of any implications of wrong doing.

"I understood it was county committee money being forwarded to the national treasury," Berliner said.

"I had no knowledge of the source, knew nothing of the background, and never heard of Mr. Mayock," Mahaney said.

He added he would be glad to send in $5,000 to the national committee "any time anybody will give it to me to send."

Malone was out of his San Francisco office and not immediately available for comment.

Lasdon, reached through his office at Yonkers, N. Y., issued this statement:

"As the record before the Kean committee goes, the record shows every cent I paid to Welburn Mayock for his services in connection with representing me before the Treasury Department in 1948 with respect to securing the tax ruling in question was in payment of a legal fee.

"I never knew, and do not now know, that any part of the legal fee so paid went to anyone other than Mr. Mayock."

ANGELENOS DENY MAKING DONATION

In Los Angeles, William R. Peeler, named by Senator WILLIAMS as a contributor of $2,500 to the 1948 Democratic campaign fund, yesterday said that he neither donated the money nor received cash from Attorney Welburn Mayock to donate.

"The attorney who handled the contributions out here," Peeler said, "just came around to the office where we worked and asked several of us if he could use our name in making the donation.

"I asked him if using my name would carry any financial, moral, or legal responsibility."

EXPLANATION GIVEN

"He said no. He said it was just a way of getting around a law that neither party paid any attention to anyway.

"He said he just wanted to use my name as a channel through which to put the donation."

Peeler said that the attorney who contacted him died a year ago. Peeler added that Government investigators questioned him about the contribution 3 years ago. He said that he told them about the matter in an affidavit.

HANDLED NO CASH

Willis Allen said last night that the circumstances under which he donated $2,500 were similar to those described by Peeler.

"Mayock was our attorney," he said, "and had helped a group in which I was interested in a case before the Supreme Court in Washington. When my brother and I and the other men were asked to lend our names for

the purpose of donating money to the Democratic fund, we were glad to do so.

"I did not handle any actual cash. As I remember, four cashier's checks were purchased and the money was sent in in this way."

Allen explained his brother Lawrence died last year. Owens works in the advertising business and Peeler was a mutual friend of the Allens and Mayock.

The Times was unable to locate the other two men, Lawrence W. Allen and Roy G. Owens, named by Senator WILLIAMS in Washington.

THE SPIRITUAL ARMAGEDDON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in March 1951 one of our most distinguished elder statesmen, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, wrote a short article published in the Reader's Digest magazine. It was called "Spiritual Armageddon Is Here Now." I desire to read excerpts from that article.

"These are times that try men's souls," wrote Thomas Paine when America was struggling to be born.

"Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. * * * Heaven knows how to put a price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Today we are being asked to place our own valuation on freedom, in the things we are ready to give up, the taxes we will pay, the self-discipline we embrace—in how quickly we will do all this. Let us not haggle, clinging to petty profits and petty comforts. Should we price freedom too low, it will be taken from us.

Unfortunately, when I urged mobilization of our military, economic, and spiritual resources—

This was in 1951—

there were too many who felt we should wait and see. They hoped that something would happen to change the attitude of our enemies—those without and those within.

Those without are Russia, and her satellites.

No doubt today he would include Communist China.

Those within are the pressure groups, selfishness, cowardice, inflation, and above all, incompetence in the management of our affairs.

The world is shaping up to a struggle between communism and individualism, between that system which feels the state should be the master and that system, ours, which feels the state should be the servant of the the individual.

The first battle of the great Armageddon is taking place within this country—now. If our democracy, our Government and the institutions founded under its Constitution, cannot control the conflicting and selfish interests for the overall welfare, Armageddon will be lost here in this country.

How can our conscience rest easily when we so unflinchingly send our young men to battle and hesitate to send our profits?

The situation demands self-denial and sacrifice. Unless we practice these things we shall lose first the spiritual battle of Armageddon and then the last battle will surely be lost—the physical one.

I repeat what I said before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, July 1950:

"Nearly 3 years ago—"

That would be 8 years now—

I clipped an item from a newspaper which seems ominously prophetic today. It told of a boast made by a Soviet general. The western democracies were bound to be defeated by the Soviet Union because they would not make the sacrifices necessary to arm themselves. They prized their standard of living too highly. They would not be willing to accept the disciplines to put "guns" over "butter."

"In Russia, though, this general boasted, the people were inured to hardship. The Soviet Government would force the sacrifices to mobilize. A lean and hungry, but mobilized Russia would overrun a western world which couldn't bring itself to mobilize—in time.

"That is the test which confronts us—not only this country but all of the free peoples of the world."

I appreciate how harsh a time Europeans have had. But the Soviets, whose people endured even more, have ruthlessly chosen to put military power ahead of improving living standards. That challenge cannot be ignored. If what is required is not done now, infinitely more will have to be given up later.

Everything might be lost under the heel of a Soviet occupation.

For almost 5 years (9 years now), since the last war's end, the Atlantic powers have put off a choice that cannot be evaded. It is the choice of mobilizing our strength now, while peace can still be saved, or of clinging to petty wants and petty profits, imperiling our freedom, and our civilization.

No outside enemy can defeat us. We can defeat ourselves. Yours is the decision. Which shall it be—less comfort or defeat?

The spiritual Armageddon is here.

Mr. President, that message was delivered by perhaps the foremost living authority on a mobilization economy. This message was delivered 4 years ago. Based upon what has happened recently, I believe it is wise policy for us to view world conditions, since he delivered that message.

The position of the free world as against the Communist position during the past 2 years gives a saddening picture of compromises and reversals.

Let us look briefly at the record. On July 26, 1953, after 3 years of bloody warfare, an uneasy truce was signed in Korea.

We are not proud of some of the terms of that truce, and less proud of the fact that we know those terms have been consistently violated, and are being violated every day.

Starting in January 1954, the month this administration announced its new reversed policy of "massive retaliation," a foreign ministers' conference was held in Berlin. The major result of that session was an invitation to the Chinese Communists to meet with the free world in Geneva; and at the subsequent Geneva conference, the Communists defeated the proposal for free elections in Korea. Defeats continued in Indochina. These defeats were highlighted finally by the loss of Dien Bien Phu.

An armistice in Indochina was signed in July 1954. By that action the free world gave up 77,000 more square miles of territory and 12 million more people to the Communist rulers behind the Iron Curtain.

On August 30, 1954, the European Defense Community collapsed when the French Assembly refused to ratify the plan.

Twice the United States Senate has expressed itself in favor of the unification of Germany, and that, too, has been blocked by the Communists. Nor have the French finally approved the subsequenty plan to rearm Western Germany, the plan developed after the failure of EDC.

I might add that at this time that possibly there are grim forebodings about the situation in Western Germany. The Chancellor of West Germany is fighting to carry out the idea of West German rearmament. In any case, is it not fair to say that, as of now, this country has fewer friends in the world than it has had in a long, long time? Certainly it is right to say we have stronger possible enemies.

The United States has just announced that, if necessary, it would defend Formosa unilaterally as a key link in its defense line in the Far East. The Communist Chinese during past months, and as recently as last week, announced that they intend to conquer Formosa. Unless this administration or the Communist Chinese change their minds, ultimately war is inevitable.

The Communists, with from 800 to 900 million people under their control, grow steadily stronger day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year. They grow stronger, not only in absolute terms, but also relatively with respect to the military strength of the free world.

The head of the Soviet military was today made the Premier of the Soviet Union; and the first acts of this planned new government, made in recent hours and in recent days, are interesting. These acts include the following:

First. The Soviets have reaffirmed their respect for, and their alliance with, Communist China.

Second. The Soviets have changed the policy of Malenkov established after the death of Stalin. They have gone to greater emphasis on military production as against Malenkov's policy of increasing the production of consumer goods.

Third. They have speeded up their plans for military expenditures. This new group of rulers in the Soviet Union as of today, however, in addition to establishing the head of the army as head of the entire Soviet Government, have announced that they will increase Soviet military expenditures by 12 percent.

Fourth. The Soviet Communists have just fired Mr. Malenkov, the one man in the Communist world who has stated that atomic warfare might destroy us all.

In that connection, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that as of today any nuclear warfare advantage which this country had may well be over. We now have what some people term the "intolerable absolute," which others term "atomic symmetry." A more simple expression would be "strategic standoff."

We have the power to deliver atomic and hydrogen bombs; and we have those bombs. The Soviets have the power to deliver atomic and hydrogen bombs; and they have those bombs.

I do not necessarily criticize this administration for the great advances the Communist world has made during the past 2 years. I do say that under the circumstances it is absolutely incredible for this administration to announce a policy which reduces our Army by

275,000 men and reduces our Marine Corps by 31,000 men—every man in the Marine Corps today is a volunteer—and creating a false impression in the minds of the American people that our Air Force is being greatly strengthened, when actually this administration is adding only 5,000 men to increase the size of the Air Force 17 full wings.

I intend later to present what is involved in these military reductions in more detail on the floor of the Senate. But surely, we must realize how these steady reductions in our plans for more military power have not only affected the morale of our allies, but have also played directly into the aggressive plans and programs of the Communist conspiracy for world conquest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Missouri is the former very able Secretary of the Air Force. If we should, God forbid, become involved in a war on the mainland of China, does the Senator believe we could win the war with the Air Force and Navy alone, or whether we would need American ground forces?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that I have heard many prophecies made about wars being won without ground troops. With the certain exception of the island of Japan, where there was tremendous ground-force fighting on the islands coming up to Japan, I know of no war being won without ground-troop action. A basic reason for Japan's surrender was that we had the atomic bomb, and they did not. That condition does not prevail today. I believe if there is war with the Communists, there will be ground fighting.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In addition to the kind of bomb we dropped in the war with Japan, we had ground troops engaging the best troops of the Imperial Japanese Army. Is not that true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true. As the Senator knows, there are many American crosses on Tarawa, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and other islands in the Pacific. These islands illustrate fully the Senator's observation.

Mr. MORSE. It was a ground war as well as a naval and air war, was it not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Missouri feel that there is some justification for concern on the part of some of us, at least, that there is a potential danger of becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Chinese Communists are sincere in their intention to conquer Formosa, and if this administration is sincere in its expressed intention to defend Formosa, inasmuch as it has already received from Congress approval to attack the mainland of China, in any manner it may see fit to prevent the fall of Formosa, it is obvious there is now a chance of land warfare on the Chinese mainland.

Mr. MORSE. If we should become involved in a war on the mainland of China, would it not be in our national self-interest to have ground forces in being to engage in the first part of the war until we could prepare our reserves for land engagements?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may attempt to penetrate behind the question of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, the point is whether we should have forces in being as against forces in reserve.

In January 1953 a report was issued by a well-known businessman which stated it was better to have mobilization lines—a mobilization base—capable of production than it was to store military production items themselves. In my years in government I have never seen or heard a more erroneous statement, because if we should become engaged in a war, and it should develop into a nuclear war, production availability would mean relatively little. What would count would be our forces in being.

It is interesting the Senator from Oregon should bring up this question of ground troops. For many years Russian Communist divisions have been understood to be 175 in number, the Chinese Communist divisions have varied from 200 to 400. But not counting the Soviet and Chinese satellites, and not counting our allies, we see from 375 to 575 divisions for the Russian and Chinese Communists.

This country now has 20 divisions, which are now planned to be cut to 13 combat divisions and 4 training divisions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a further question and observation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that, in view of the potential dangers in Asia which I think exist from the standpoint of the security of our country, it would be better, if we are thinking about the psychological effect on the Kremlin, to be announcing to the world that we are increasing our ground forces rather than decreasing them?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course. The Senator has, as is usual with his penetrating mind, singled out a major point. The implication is that we are stronger everywhere, and that, therefore, we can slough off our ground-troop strength. With utmost sincerity I say I do not believe we can ever side-line our ground-troop strength.

Mr. President, the Soviets are far superior under the sea than the Nazis ever were, as compared to the under-the-sea strength of the free world.

Although our Navy, on the surface of the sea, is relatively very strong, and in all forms of war that is important, in the Far East as we announced we will go to war if Formosa is attacked we are badly outnumbered in the air.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a further observation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am one Senator who thinks that in this critical hour it is much more important that we balance our military strength against what we know to be the Communist strength than to pay so much attention to balancing the budget. I think it is more important at the present time that the American people go down into their pockets and pay for adequate defense than that they go along with an administration which I believe, in the name of economy, is weakening our defense and our Military Establishment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

I should like to read three or four paragraphs which conclude my remarks, and then shall be glad to yield for any questions. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his penetrating analysis of what can be properly called America's new policy of "strength through weakness."

But I do say that under these circumstances it is absolutely incredible for us, to announce a policy which is reducing our Army some 275,000 men, reducing our Marine Corps 31,000 men, every man of whom is a volunteer, and providing only 5,000 men to increase our Air Force 17 wings.

I intend later to present these matters in more detail on the floor of the Senate, but surely we must realize how these steady reductions in military power have not only affected the morale of our allies, but also have played directly into the progressive plans and programs of the Communists.

Not only have we increased the morale in the lands of our possible enemies and reduced it in the lands of our possible allies, but we have played false with the American people by reassuring them as against telling them the truth about the danger in the world in which we now live.

As the Communists continue to develop their position, gaining ground for their oft-repeated intention of destroying the free world, we should remember two basic factors in this entire picture.

First, now nearly a billion people are ruled directly by men who do not believe in God, and therefore have little respect for human life as they continue their plans and programs to conquer the free world.

Mr. President, we should never forget that the Soviets in turn have almost never failed ultimately to do what they said they were going to do. Stalin himself often said before and after V–J Day that they intended to make their plans and programs coincide with their primary desire—the conquest of the entire world.

The second basic factor is that the only possible justification for reducing our armed strength, despite the diplomatic failures of the past 2 years and the great and growing strength of our possible enemy, is a desire to pursue our luxurious way of life.

It would seem we are now turning our back on Almighty God in favor of the almighty dollar.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I congratulate and thank my distinguished colleague for his very able and useful speech. I wonder whether the Senator from Missouri recalls that before it was generally known that the United States had developed the atom bomb, which we were able then to drop on Japan, it was the generally accepted estimate that if it were necessary to fight with our ground forces in Japan, we would suffer a minimum of one million casualties, even though at that time we were not fighting alone but had the support of many of our very dependable allies.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from New York I am sure knows those figures. I do not happen to know them. But I am confident his memory is proper.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. My recollection on that point is very distinct. I do not think it would be very difficult to demonstrate it both by the many releases to the press and statements made on the floor of the Senate.

But what I am seeking to drive home at this time is this: We are undertaking responsibilities in Asia which are beyond those that were contemplated 2 or 3 years ago, responsibilities which may involve us not only in a naval war and an air war, but also in ground fighting. Yet we find ourselves in a position in which our air strength is little greater than it was 2 or 3 years ago; our naval strength certainly is no greater; and each year we have seen a diminution in the strength of our Army.

Coincidentally with the lessening of our strength, we know that the military strength, in the air, on the sea, and on the land, of both Russia and China has vastly increased over the last 3 or 4 years. In other words, is it not true that the gap which existed some years ago between our military strength and the strength of our potential enemies, the Communists principally, Russia—because China at that time was not a great military factor—instead of being narrowed as our responsibilities increased, has actually widened? Is not the gap today very substantially larger than it was some years ago?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Our responsibilities have been growing steadily, not only because of our commitments, but also because—and I believe this to be a fair statement—the United States is the one great power left in the free world which is able to resist the advances of world communism provided we become adequately strong.

Second, for many years after World War II the United States had what has been called, and I believe properly so, the atomic deterrent. It was known that our strategic air force could destroy any country which attacked us. But now there is a strategic standoff from the standpoint of nuclear weapons, so that, if there are to be peripheral wars, the chances are we shall be fighting such wars on terms favorable to the enemy.

Without getting into any discussion of when, where, or how we will use nuclear weapons, my belief is this country can in no way justify what it has been doing in the past 2 years, namely, steadily reducing its plans for military strength while its possible enemy has been steadily increasing its military strength and, at the same time, steadily increasing its international commitments.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to join with other Senators in congratulating the Senator from Missouri on his very timely, forthright, and necessary speech concerning our national defense and its inadequacy at the present moment.

But I gathered from the Senator's remarks that he believes there is a greater threat to the security of the United States and the peace of the world by reason of the removal of Mr. Malenkov as the head of the Soviet Union. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. I made that statement based not only on what I have read in the newspapers and heard on the radio today, but also after discussing the matter with experts on Soviet Russia.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is because of that fact, I take it, that the Senator from Missouri is urging in the Senate today that we take some affirmative action immediately in respect to the entire defense situation. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator read in last night's Washington Evening Star an Associated Press article which quoted Secretary of Defense Wilson. The article reads, in part, as follows:

> Secretary of Defense Wilson said today the Armed Forces are losing far too many trained men to private industry and lately we have seen an already critical situation get worse.

Had the Senator been aware, as the Secretary of Defense had suddenly said, that the situation is critical? Or is this something new? I had not read of this previously; I wondered if the Senator from Missouri had.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I saw that article. Sometimes it is hard to follow the Secretary of Defense in his comments and opinions on the problems of military departments.

Mr. SMATHERS. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if he can explain to me the following quotation by the article of a statement by Mr. Wilson:

> "Approximately 1 million men—one-third of our planned size for the active forces—will become eligible for some form of release during the next year. This high turnover rate is extremely costly in dollars, but it is even more costly in terms of loss of experience and operational efficiency.
>
> "The readiness of our combat units will be difficult to improve if we are unable to induce more men to stay with us longer."

In the light of that statement, with which I personally agree, can the Senator from Missouri help me reconcile the reduction by the Secretary of Defense in the size of the Army by 275,000 men, and the reduction in the size of the Marine Corps by 32,000?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My answer to the distinguished junior Senator from Florida is that it is all too obvious to some of us, as it is to him, based upon the article to which he has referred, that this administration is not practicing what it preaches.

The morale in the armed services is low. Two interesting letters were published only last night on the editorial page of the Evening Star, one from a lieutenant colonel in the Army, the other from a captain in the Navy. Much of the personnel in the armed services today believe that the services are little more than training grounds for private industry.

They point out that the relative differences in salaries received by various personnel—mechanics, electricians, pilots, etc.—and the salaries received by such persons in private industry handling the same type of work. Recently the Secretary of the Air Force announced he expected to lose 150,000 out of the 200,000 four-year enlistments at about the time of the Korean War. The average cost of training such individuals is $14,000. The loss in personnel would therefore represent a loss to the American taxpayers of more than $2 billion. The loss of a jet pilot incidentally costs the American taxpayers $120,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator not agree that if Secretary Wilson actually desired to keep in the Armed Forces the trained and experienced men to whom reference was made in the article, it would be the course of wisdom for him to set aside the called-for reduction of 31,000 Marines and 275,000 Army personnel, who have been trained? We know the Marines want to stay in the service. Would that not be the best way to get the additional men needed?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have seen many paradoxical programs but never before one which involved discharging 31,000 men from the Marine Corps (every one a volunteer) at the same time a request is made for continuation of the draft in order to draft untrained men into the armed services.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Before I put my question, I should like to commend the Senator for recognizing that it is time that America made up its mind about making a sufficient sacrifice to guarantee the peace. I have a question or two to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri about things he said during the course of his statement.

The first question is directed at his remarks in reference to the Korean

truce we signed, and the apparent violations of it and the lack of enforcement of its terms. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks we should not have signed a truce at all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the distinguished Senator asking me whether I think we should or should not have signed a truce?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe a truce was desirable, but I hesitate to think of the criticism which would have been visited on the previous administration first if it had signed the type of truce which was signed, and, secondly, if it had been as casual in seeing that the terms of the truce were enforced.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator think the war in Korea as it was waged under the former Democratic administration was waged in the traditionally honorable American fashion, when, having won the war twice on the field of battle, we nevertheless lost it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know whether the war in Korea was fought in the way either the Senator from Arizona or many other persons believe it should have been fought. But I am less interested now in what has happened in Korea than what is going to happen, not only around Formosa, but in many other parts of the world. I do not believe that this time there is much use in crying over what has already taken place in Korea.

The reason for my making these few remarks on the floor today, is that any man who can read now knows about the military strength of the Communists all over the world. This strength is steadily increasing, and the Communist forces are steadily advancing, despite the efforts of this administration to prevent this advance. This country, the only real power in the free world able to stop the world advance of atheistic communism, is steadily, day by day, reducing its military strength. I believe the reduction endangers our freedom. That was the point of my remarks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator deny that the result of Korea and the way we handled that struggle has an effect upon the situation today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The results of World War II also have effect on the situation today. The results of World War I have effect on the situation today. I think the results of all wars fought in this century have effect on the situation today. We have been affected by our first war and every war since the first. A military expert has said that 20,000 regulars on either side could have decided in a few weeks our bloody 4-year-long war between the States.

If there is one thing we should have learned from the Korean war, along with every war in which this country has ever engaged, it is that we always pay heavily because we are not prepared.

My point today, I repeat once more, is that in this time of hydrogen bombs and nuclear standoff, we are not facing up to the growing strength of communism. What we are facing up to is the importance of the dollar to the few.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With regard to what the Senator from Missouri has said about our facing up to the problem, does he feel that we faced up to the Communists in Korea in the way America has traditionally faced up to its military problems? If our traditional methods had been followed, we would not be faced with the danger we confront today in the Formosa Strait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think that premise is wrong. Korea in no way affected the growing strength of Russia. In that respect Korea was the same to the Russians as the Berlin airlift, which was described by Winston Churchill as proving that we could stand on our heads indefinitely while the Russians sat in an armchair. No matter who won in Korea, the fact is that while the Chinese Communists, Korea, and the United States were destroying their resources, the Soviet leaders in Moscow were sitting back in an armchair.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the Senator agrees with the way the Korean war was conducted, namely, that our pilots should not bomb beyond the Yalu or destroy military or strategic supplies in that area. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; the Senator from Arizona is not correct in assuming that is my viewpoint. I have often said that if American boys are sent out to fight, they should be sent with every opportunity to win. However, I say to my colleague, for whom I have great admiration and respect, that this country must now face up to the change in Soviet policy, if it was a change, just announced.

I do not see how it is constructive to debate and refight the Korean war in the Senate. What I think important are plans to resist future Communist aggression. I emphasize to my distinguished colleague, if I may, the word "future."

Mr. GOLDWATER. If my colleague will yield further, I have just 1 or 2 other questions in connection with the Senator's statement. I am inclined to agree with him that it is wrong to rehash the Korea fighting, but military history has a way of repeating itself. Having drawn attention to what should not have been done or should have been done in the Korean fighting by the former administration, does the Senator from Missouri feel that we should again be drawn into a war in which we could not bomb beyond a certain point for fear of injuring the feelings of the Soviet Union?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not remember any such argument about Korea. I do not think it is constructive at this time to argue about the way the Korean war was fought. That was all I said about the Korean war.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will pardon me, let me say he was criticizing the present administration for a truce; and I wanted to bring out, by questioning, which I feel I have done, that the truce was better than a continuation of the conditions in Korea at the time the truce was brought about.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, Mr. President; if I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, I was not criticizing the truce. What I was criticizing was what has happened after the truce.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Missouri has not answered my question regarding Formosa; and I understand that he does not care to answer it because he feels it relates back to Korea.

So I shall proceed, if I may——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this point let me interrupt the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not quite understand the Senator's question with respect to Formosa. I shall be glad to try to answer, although I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I may not be as well versed in the matter as he is. However, I shall be glad to try to answer.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Of course, the Senator from Missouri has discussed a military subject. Neither am I a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure the Senator from Missouri realizes my limited knowledge, as well as his own, in this field.

However, my question, as I recall it, was as follows: Having drawn a line in the Formosa area—an action which I said I felt we should have done at some more advantageous spot, 10 years ago, instead of turning our backs on Chiang Kai-shek—and following the events of the Korean episode, would the Senator from Missouri now suggest a line on the Continent beyond which we should not bomb, for fear of injuring the feelings of the Soviets?

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, as to some of the Senator's premises to his question.

As I remember, the line regarding Formosa was drawn in 1950 under the previous administration. Incidentally, let me say that I was glad to see that the President had the judgment to reverse himself with respect to the "unleashing" aspect of something he said in January 1953—something obviously wrong, and which I am sure he said only because he was misadvised by some of his advisers.

About Formosa, I voted for the request of the President of the United States; and I did so on the theory that in these times we should all stick together. I voted for his request to handle the Formosa situation the way he saw fit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have a further question to ask, and it is prompted because of many conversations the Senator from Missouri and I have had on the subject of airpower. He mentioned the retaliation speech of Secretary Dulles. I think it was delivered on either January 12 or January 13 of last year. Does not the Senator from Missouri think that speech might prove to be the first recognition of the true use of airpower in our national strategy?

If the Senator from Missouri will indulge me, I should like to elaborate a bit on that point, because during our conversations we have not quite gone into the aspect I have in mind. I have always been interested—in fact, ever since the days when the distinguished Senator from Missouri was head of the Air Force—in the possibilities of applying to

airpower Mahan's doctrine of naval supremacy. It is my feeling that Secretary Dulles' statement about massive retaliation is the first recognition that we are now in a new epoch of geophysical condition, wherein a new means of communication dictates another look at the method of waging war.

Let me say, if the Senator from Missouri will permit a further interruption—and I shall be brief in this reference—that in this field we might start with a consideration of the massive land-attack theory of Genghis Khan, and its subsequent improvement by Alexander the Great, and its modern development by Admiral Mahan, in his application of it to naval power in the British Isles and the British Empire.

Today, now that another means of communication has come into the picture, is it not the feeling of the Senator from Missouri that we should take another look at the weapons system and at the way war will be waged in the future?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree, Mr. President, with some of the very interesting and well-thought-out comments the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona has just made. The idea of an all-powerful army, as developed by Genghis Khan, or an all-powerful navy as developed by the British in the 19th century, however, has now gone out the window from the standpoint of our exercising of air power on a similar basis in this age, because today the Soviets and their satellites have an air force comparable to our own; and they also have atomic and hydrogen bombs.

I refer the distinguished Senator from Arizona to recent articles, among them the excellent Walkowicz article on the "Counter-Force Strategy," question of having the punishment fit the crime, and also the Leghorn article, "No need to bomb cities to win wars"—along the same line. They relate to the question of whether we can and should use nuclear weapons in peripheral wars, or wars of discrimination; or whether we should reserve such weapons for all-out wars, and so forth. That is a subject in itself.

I do not think it possible for the United States to now consider that it possesses a deterrent shield as a result of its airpower because our airpower is little greater than Communist airpower at this time, and that is especially true if we include the great advantage of a surprise attack in this nuclear age.

Therefore, I feel the massive-retaliation speech was a mistake. In a sense it was a bluff which did not work, for the Communist attack in Indochina was made after the speech was made. In my opinion, the massive-retaliation theory does not represent a military philosophy behind which we can establish the security of the United States.

I would have much more respect for that character of approach to military policies if we were not chopping our military strength in order to be sure we have the best possible financial position. I believe we are putting figures—money—before forces; I believe we are stressing our high standard of living ahead of our security. I do not think we should be lulled by the false premise incident to the massive-retaliation theory presented last January.

As a matter of fact, many subsequent talks by this administration have been efforts, subsequent to Mr. Dulles' statement, to refute the massive retaliation theory.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to make one more observation, let me say that my question was directed at one point, namely, that while Secretary Dulles' statement might have been misunderstood or misapprehended around the world, nevertheless I believe it is the first pronouncement by anyone in this Government to indicate that we now understand airpower as a part of our national strategy.

As for the possibility that Russia and ourselves are equal either in nuclear weapons or in airplanes, I might suggest to the Senator from Missouri that such a situation almost always exists in warfare. Offhand, I cannot recall any war in which one side was predominantly stronger than the other, in the matter of weapons. So far as weapons are concerned, the situation is always one of a stand-off.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for permitting me to ask these questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, Mr. President, let me say that I always enjoy discussion on military matters with my good friend, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. In World War II, he was a great pilot; and he has a broad understanding of these problems. So it is a privilege to discuss them with him on the floor of the Senate.

Now I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for the fine address he has made today, and to associate myself with the objectives and the philosophy of that address. I should like to ask 1 or 2 questions to round out the record. In due course, I intend to speak on my own time.

With reference to the very practical matter which faces us, is the Senator aware of the fact that over the weekend the Department of Defense announced the withdrawal of the 1st Marine Division from Korea, to return home?

Mr. SYMINGTON. This is further evidence of the policy of strength through weakness.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator sees in the withdrawal of this very important combat division from a critical area a withdrawal from the scene of tension into a scene of greater calmness and solemnity. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me ask my brilliant and distinguished friend from Minnesota to consider some of the battles of the War Between the States. I refer to such encounters as Antietam, Chancellorsville, Fredericksburg, and so forth. If one side had announced that it did not intend to give up a particular piece of ground, and the other side announced that it intended to capture that piece of ground, and then the next day it heard, or saw, that the troops of its opponent had retreated, what would be the natural reaction in terms of morale, or in terms of additional aggressiveness, on the side of those who did not retreat?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield further to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This publicized withdrawal of the 1st Marine Division is a withdrawal from the cease-fire line in Korea. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, at a time when tension in the Far East is at a critical point, to the extent that the Congress is called upon to give a preauthorization for the use of armed forces in the Pacific area, and at a time when we are told that the world faces one of its most critical hours, we withdraw the best fighting division we have from Korea, where we know that there is a Chinese buildup for an attack at any time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true.

Within recent weeks an excellent article was written by Ernest Lindley, which showed that in the past 9 months we have changed our military plans and programs 5 times. Anyone who knows anything about the military service, or industrial operations, knows that under such a type and character of procedure we are steadily wasting great sums of the taxpayers' money. This administration will probably again change its recently announced policies if what we read today is true. That will be change No. 6 in 10 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was some colloquy a moment ago with the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] over the action in Korea. Without going into the military merits or demerits of that action, is it not true that by the action in Korea the United States took on a position of strength and defense, as compared with what was happening just prior to Korea? Did we not build up our strength?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that. The basic point about Korea is that we fought a bloody war in a limited periphery, thousands of miles away from home, primarily because we were not prepared. Yet it seems that now we are undertaking infinitely greater commitments without taking any advantage of our experience gained from the Korean war, from World War II, and from all the other wars, as to the importance of being prepared.

Now we are in the hydrogen age. The situation has never been better stated than it was by President Theodore Roosevelt when he said, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." At a time when we are apparently becoming more belligerent and outspoken about what we intend to defend and how, we are also steadily whittling away at our stick.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I conclude with this observation. Up to the point

of the truce in Korea, the military planning and the forces in being of the United States of America were on the increase. In other words, our strength was being increased monthly. Beginning in January 1953, we cut $5 billion from the Air Force appropriations. We cut more than $11 billion, in terms of new money and unobligated funds, from the total defense budget. We have been steadily cutting. Even as late as December 1954, from the highest office in this land, word came that the international scene looked better, that there were better prospects for peace. My comment then was that the statement reminded me of what another President said in the spring of 1950. He said that we then confronted our best opportunity for peace, and that the prospects for peace looked better than ever before. In the spring of 1950, from high places the international scene looked good. In December of 1954, the international scene looked good. In February of 1955, the international scene looks bleak, and the cold winter of our discontent is settling upon us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I agree with the junior Senator from Minnesota.

In September 1951, while the Korean war was going on, the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously gave to the administration and thereupon to the American people, a program for increasing our strength. Shortly after January 1953 that program was sunk. Today, in the face of the growing danger, we continue to make plans to weaken our military position. It does not make sense.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE DEFENSE OF FORMOSA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial written by Mr. Charles A. Sprague, former Republican Governor of the State of Oregon, in connection with the Formosan issue. The editorial is dated January 24, 1955.

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

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

CHICAGO, January 24.—The afternoon papers report President Eisenhower's appeal to Congress for authorization to use United States military forces for defending Formosa and the Pescadores from conquest by Red China. This will require United States assistance in ferrying Nationalist troops from the exposed islands adjacent to the mainland. Then the President made this startling declaration of policy:

"Be alert to any concentration of employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action."

There in miniscule but nonetheless sharp and clear is "preventive war." We would not only defend Formosa from Communist attack but bomb troop concentrations and boat assemblies which point to the launching of a Red invasion of Formosa. The President's message brought a prompt rejoinder from Premier Chou En-lai of Communist China, denouncing United States intervention in China's affairs, even quoting the Charter of United Nations in support of the Communist decision.

The Daily News here reports this conflict of policy between the United States and Red China; and between the two statements runs a dispatch from its own veteran correspondent in the Far East, Keyes Beech, who reported from Taipeh, Formosa:

"The United States is closer to war with Red China than at any time since the critical battle of Dien Bien Phu."

He reported before Eisenhower's message reached him and based his judgment on the imminent evacuation of Nationalists from the Tachen islands which would expose American shipping to Communist bombing or shelling.

I persist in the view that no general war between the United States and Red China will break out in the immediate future. But the ratification of the treaty with Chiang and the grant of authority by the Congress to the Executive to defend Formosa even to the extent of destroying Communist military concentrations preparing for an invasion freezes hostility which points toward war. This seems to me to be a wrong course.

The President says: "Our purpose is peace;" but goes on to say that Red China's threats pose a serious danger to this country's security, "and indeed to the peace of the world." But do not our formal warnings amount to threats which endanger peace in the Orient and perhaps for the world?

Our Government faces very critical problems and seeks I know solutions which will preserve our national security without resort to war, if that is possible. It inherited this defense of Formosa from the Truman Administration. I cannot help but believe, however, that we are letting Formosa become a stone around our necks. Instead of becoming more deeply involved with Chiang Kai-shek we should seek honorable release from our extended commitments through processes of negotiation or mediation.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with Governor Sprague's remarks. I desire particularly to emphasize this paragraph:

I persist in the view that no general war between the United States and Red China will break out in the immediate future. But the ratification of the treaty with Chiang and the grant of authority by the Congress to the Executive to defend Formosa even to the extent of destroying Communist military concentrations preparing for an invasion freezes hostility which points toward war. This seems to me to be a wrong course.

Governor Sprague then goes on to expand his point of view. I think he is unanswerably right, and in my judgment the events of history will prove how right he is.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the February 3, 1955, issue of the Manchester Guardian weekly. It is not complimentary to the United States or to Red China, or to the course of action which is being followed in Asia. It gives some support to the view of a few of us who have dared to rise on the floor of the Senate and caution our country about what we think is a greatly mistaken course of action in Asia.

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

STAND BACK

The Commonwealth conference is opportune. Having no doubt begun with Formosa it may unite the commonwealth governments in saying some necessary words to China and the United States. These words should be said plainly, whether in public through a joint declaration or in private through Mr. Nehru and Sir Anthony Eden. China should be told that any attempt to take Formosa by force would be wrong and would certainly bring upon her severe American action. It would be wrong in law and humanity. The legal question is, admittedly, obscured because the status of Formosa as an island seems in suspense. The Japanese peace treaty removed it from Japan, but no other treaty has returned it to China; the Cairo and Potsdam declarations were expressions of intent and were subject to review, which has not yet taken place. But whatever the legal position, there is a much greater aspect in humanity. It is that a Chinese attempt to take Formosa by force would lead to immense slaughter even if the Americans did not intervene. For the Nationalists it would be a last stand, since they have nowhere else to go and could expect no mercy from the Communists. The inevitable slaughter is something that no civilized nation could condone. It would be wrong by any acceptable standard of morals and by the spirit of the United Nations Charter. If Nationalist attacks upon the mainland are stopped—as we must hope they will be by the United States at once—the Chinese Communists would condemn themselves of barbaric inhumanity if they were to try taking Formosa by force. The reiterated threats from Peking to exterminate Chiang's "traitorous" clique may have some justification while the Nationalists continue bombing the mainland, but they will have none when such attacks finally cease. Then an assault across the straits would bring upon China not only the military weight of America but the moral hostility of most other nations.

To the United States also stern words should be said by the Commonwealth conference. It must withdraw the Nationalists to Formosa and the Pescadores at once and confine them there. To pretend that the United States cannot stop the bombing across the Straits is nonsense. The aircraft are American, the bombs American, and the Nationalist headquarters are in close consultation with the American military commanders. The bombing would stop tomorrow if Washington insisted. The United States should further be told that its reasons for supporting the defence of the Matsu and Quemoy islands are gravely mistaken. It is an error even to say, as the State Department is now doing, that these islands should not be abandoned except as part of a negotiated cease-fire. The chances of negotiating a cease-fire now are tiny, whereas the chance of producing a cease-fire by direct action are great. The comment from Peking leaves little likelihood that the fighting can be stopped through negotiation, whether by the Security Council or some other agency. But by physically separating the forces—by putting the width of the Straits between them—a cease-fire may be produced in fact if not formally. The Chinese would probably not want to challenge the American Seventh Fleet, especially if the mainland were no longer being hit. They would continue to fulminate, but the fighting would be over. The Commonwealth countries ought strongly to advocate this practical method of reaching a cease-fire. One other thing they ought to say to the United States. It is that the maneuvering of American naval and air units beside the Tachen islands or anywhere close inshore is highly dangerous and should be avoided. Mr. Molotov has given a plain hint that if it is known which islands are being evacuated by the Nationalists their departure will be unmolested. Let that be tested in practice. The alternative of providing American naval and air cover means sending ships and planes over Chinese territory and through territorial waters. A small skirmish—perhaps starting with reconnaissance patrols on each side—may draw in greater units and so lead to a violent explosion. The risk is not worth taking.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not take time today to discuss the Formosa treaty. I voted against it in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning. I shall state my reasons in opposition to that treaty tomorrow; but because I have been pressed by the newspapers at least to give some inkling of the reason for my opposition to the treaty, let me say that I believe in saying what we mean and meaning what we say. In the treaty we do not say what we mean. The evidence of it is that this morning the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee had to agree upon language to be embodied in the committee's report which qualifies and changes the meaning of the treaty, so far as they, as individuals, are concerned. But the sad thing is that every member of the Foreign Relations Committee knows that language written into a committee report has no legal status whatever so far as the meaning of the treaty under international law is concerned.

In a Senate committee report Senators can write to their heart's content their views and ideas of what they think should be in a treaty itself. But unless the provisions they favor are embodied in the treaty itself, they have no standing in the eyes of treaty law. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I do not propose to vote for a treaty which does not convey the meaning I believe it should convey, and then go along with some explanatory or clarifying language in a committee report which has no legal effect upon the treaty itself. The fact is that if we mean what we say in a committee report, we ought to write it into the treaty.

I believe the American people will understand that. I believe the American people want us to mean what we say, and to say what we mean.

I should like to say, for the benefit of the press, that my last argument on this point today is: I do not believe in entering into a treaty with a man who is involved in a civil war in China. We have legal rights in Formosa under international law. We ought to protect those rights. But we should not enter into a treaty with a participant in a civil war, who even as recently as within the last few hours has notified the world of his intention to return to the mainland of China.

Mr. President, when we ratify the treaty I hope Senators will remember that we place ourselves under the moral obligation to back up what it says.

We will not get very far by saying, "Oh, literally, we will not have to go along with any attack on the mainland."

Moreover, Mr. President, we will strengthen Chiang's claim to sovereign rights over Formosa. At the present time, under international law, no one owns Formosa. The question of ownership ought to be settled by the juridical processes of the United Nations. It cannot be denied that even the Secretary of State admits that if we enter into the treaty we necessarily strengthen the claim of the Nationalist Chinese to sovereign rights over Formosa. When we do that we augment the danger of war in Asia. We do not augment the danger of a war in Asia if we hold fast to the principle of the joint resolution which Congress passed with respect to our right to defend Formosa.

As the Manchester Guardian points out, we greatly enhance the danger of our whole position in Asia when we go along with the ambiguities of the resolution—and the same thing applies to the treaty—with respect to defending areas outside the island of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I believe that is sufficient for me to say today, to enable the press to have some understanding of the legal basis of my objection to the treaty.

Oh, I know that it will be called another one of those legalisms. Mr. President, we have actually reached such a point in debate in the Senate that when we argue in favor of respecting existing international law, we are charged with resorting to legalisms. Let me tell everyone that my country cannot afford to walk out on the obligations we owe in international law, and we cannot justify such a course. With all the emphasis at my command I say that we cannot afford to besmirch the glorious record the United States has maintained for all the decades of its history of standing fast to its obligations under international law. In both the joint resolution which has been passed and in the treaty, in my judgment, we are not keeping faith with the international law obligations of this country. If that is resorting to a legalism, I plead guilty.

I am willing to let history be the judge as to whether the fight we made in opposition to the joint resolution was justified and whether the fight we will make in opposition to the treaty will be justified so far as the best interests of this country are concerned. Eventually we will have to submit our cause to a juridical tribunal. I hope we will be able to hold up our heads and take the judgment of history on the record we make.

Let me say that on the record we are making, both in the joint resolution and in the treaty, we are headed straight for a decision against us in the decades ahead by any juridical tribunal that lets international law be the basis of its decision.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, when the joint resolution giving the very broad powers to the President of the United States was before the Senate last week, I stood beside the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in voting to limit those powers and finally in voting against the joint resolution. I did so because I felt strongly that the resolution would increase the danger of our country becoming involved in a disastrous and catastrophic war, and would also cause us to surrender the sound juridical positions which this country must always assume and follow if we are to have the confidence and support of the free world.

I wish to make it very clear that I intend to support the Senator's position when the debate on the treaty begins tomorrow. In the meantime, this afternoon I wish to associate myself with his remarks and with his reasoning. I, of course, expect in due time to speak at length on several of the provisions of the treaty.

I cannot help but express very deep regret that the treaty, which is certainly as important and far reaching in its effect as any treaty that has come before the Senate in a generation or more, should be hurried through with as little chance for orderly consideration as is proposed.

I hope there will be full debate on the treaty.

There has been very brief consideration of the treaty by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The report of the committee is not yet available, and probably it will not be available until shortly before the treaty is called up in the Senate. The public has had no chance to study or consider it.

I think that is most unfortunate. A treaty of such importance should be given ample consideration in committee, and on the floor of the Senate, after deliberate and careful study. And above all, the public should have an opportunity to know and give weight to its implications.

Only 15 Senators serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations. For an account of what happened in the committee room the other 81 Senators must in great part depend upon the report of the committee. That report will not be available until tomorrow very shortly before the treaty is taken up in the Chamber. The public will have little or no chance to know how it affects them or time to make their views known to their representatives in the Congress. The issue before us is much too important and farreaching to be determined in this summary fashion.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to announce the program for the Senate beginning tomorrow.

When the Senate concludes its business today, it will adjourn until tomorrow, when the legislative program will be as follows:

First, the Senate will take up H. R. 587, commonly known as the GI bill, to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to obtain educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

Following the disposition of that bill, the Senate will consider Senate Joint Resolution 14, which deals with the Olympic Games, which should take very little time to consider.

Following the disposition of those two measures, the Senate will take up the treaty between the United States and the Republic of China. How long consideration of the treaty will take, of course, will be determined by the membership of the Senate.

TAX EXEMPTIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah rises to remark the twilight of a principle that most of us have always accepted as everlasting, a principle contained in the

famous phrase, "There is nothing more certain than death and taxes."

Death we still have with us, but those of us who have accepted taxes as inevitable and eternal have reckoned without the genius of a great American tax authority, Mr. Beardsley Ruml. This history-making achievement deserves reporting in Mr. Ruml's own words, which I shall read from an advertisement which has appeared recently in several of our more forward-looking weekly magazines and daily newspapers. The text I have before me appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, January 23, 1955.

The headline reads "Now Puerto Rico Offers a 100-Percent Tax Exemption to New Industry."

It is written by Mr. Beardsley Ruml. It continues:

"We do not want runaway industry," says Governor Muñoz, "but we want new and expanding industries. To get them we promise freedom from all taxes, local and Federal."

Let me repeat the heart of Mr. Ruml's achievement so that its full import will sink in:

We want new and expanding industries. To get them we promise freedom from all taxes, local and Federal.

No wonder another American businessman, now resident of Puerto Rico, can be quoted in the advertisement as having said, "The climate is probably as close to Paradise as man will ever see." If he refers to the tax climate, this is a modest understatement. It is Paradise, pure and undefiled.

Lest any reader should believe this is mere enthusiasm, the advertisement features a box, setting forth in cold figures the glorious prospects. First it gives examples of "how corporate tax exemption boosts profits." One of these says that if a mainland corporation's profit after United States corporate income tax is $485,500, its net profit in Puerto Rico would be $1 million, a gain of 106 percent.

But this is only the beginning. In this Paradise they have dividend tax exemption, too. These twin exemptions, corporate and dividend, can really produce a money miracle.

Consider first the case of a mainlander who is the sole owner of a corporation earning $1 million a year. On the mainland, after corporate taxes, this will shrink to $480,000; and if he pays all that to himself as a dividend, he has less than $70,000 to spend, 7 percent for himself and 93 percent for Uncle Sam.

And then he reads Ruml's advertisement and moves his corporation and himself to Paradise. Here he begins and ends—with his million intact, tax-free—14 times better off than he was. All this is also explained with beautiful figures in another section of the advertisement captioned "How Dividend Tax Exemption Boosts Income."

But lest the reader of the advertisement be left to believe that these figures are theoretical only, Mr. Ruml quotes a specific instance of an actual blessing that has already come to pass.

He says:

A recent analysis for one Ohio firm revealed that due to tax exemption and operating economies, it will increase its net profit from $187,000 to $442,000 a year by locating its plant in Puerto Rico.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. President, I feel some responsibility for our Federal income-tax structure, which Mr. Ruml dismisses so lightheartedly. Therefore I have rapidly developed what might be called a professional curiosity about what goes on. This speech is in the nature of a very preliminary report.

First, why can Puerto Rico offer Federal-tax exemptions to emigrant mainland industries? The first step was taken approximately 36 years ago in the Organic Act, which provided that residents of Puerto Rico, who by the act also became American citizens, would not be subject to the Federal income tax.

However, the real gimmick appeared in 1950, when the law was changed to provide that citizens born or naturalized anywhere in the United States, but who later became residents of Puerto Rico, could enjoy the same exclusion privilege with respect to income earned from sources within Puerto Rico. A similar privilege was provided for corporations. These provisions were affirmed in the 1954 Revenue Act, specifically by sections 931, 932, and 933 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Does that mean that all such citizens and corporations during these years have escaped income tax in Puerto Rico? By no means—because the Commonwealth has set up its own system of Commonwealth income taxes roughly paralleling our own, and we can assume that, at least until recently, these taxes have been applied for the benefit of the revenue of the Commonwealth.

But the Puerto Rican tax structure is fearfully and wonderfully made, for it contains a most unusual feature known as "industrial tax exemptions." This permits the government of the island to give complete exemptions from the Puerto Rican individual or corporate income tax, or any other island taxes, to income derived from investments in Puerto Rico. Under the Puerto Rican law, the investment must be unique in Puerto Rico, or of a type the government believes will aid the economy. It is this feature of the act which Mr. Ruml now advertises in leading American papers and magazines as an inducement for American industry to come to Puerto Rico. The fact that the government reserves the right to give this exemption at all constitutes a frightening departure from the principle of equality before the law on which our whole theory of American taxation is based. This is empirical bureaucratic determination of basic tax obligations, which anyone with a ready imagination can translate into potential official favoritism. To quote the advertisement again:

To get all the facts and find out whether you and your company would be eligible for complete tax exemption, mail the coupon below.

The address, of course, is 579 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Mr. Ruml, in his advertisement, says:

This is perhaps Puerto Rico's finest hour and the United States manufacturers who decide to become a part of it will not go unrewarded financially or spiritually.

There is no question about the financial reward, but since the blatant tone of this advertisement is tax avoidance, I question the spiritual benefits, even though the advertisement steers close to the wind of morality and quotes Governor Muñoz as saying, "We do not want runaway industry."

As though this were not paradise enough, Puerto Rico offers really to gild the lily. To quote the advertisement again:

The Commonwealth will leave no stone unturned to get you started. It will build a factory for you. It will help you secure finance. It will even screen job applicants for you—and then train them to operate your machines.

There is at least an inference in these statements that this will be done, either without cost or a rate below the corresponding rate on the mainland. And, there are still more blessings to come tumbling out of this golden cornucopia. Puerto Rico is not bound by our Federal minimum wage laws. Its average industrial wage rate is about 45 cents an hour as compared with about $1.35 an hour for similar industries on the mainland, and costs will reflect this great competitive advantage. No taxes—low wages. Let us stop and add this up.

"Come to Puerto Rico," says the government of the Commonwealth. We will finance your company, build your building, train your people, all at government expense. Then you can build larger profits on a wage scale two-thirds below that on the mainland, and we will exempt the whole shebang from any taxes—factory, corporate profits and dividends—provided we like you well enough to agree that your company is either unique or of a type that will aid the economy.

So long as the tax and other advantages given in Puerto Rico operated largely, if not solely, to increase the standard of living in the Commonwealth, we in the Congress, and specifically in the Senate Finance Committee, could probably maintain a benevolent blindness to its effect on the Federal revenue, but when official advertisements, which quote the Governor and carry the authoritative hallmark of Mr. Beardsley Ruml, are printed in mainland newspapers, inviting persons and corporations from the mainland to come to Puerto Rico and escape from their share of the tax burden that is being borne by all of us who remain on our native mainland soil, including all corporations and most American wage earners, I think it is time the whole problem is carefully studied.

Exemption of native born Puerto Ricans and their emigrant ex-mainland neighbors is not the only fiscal advantage this Commonwealth has been given. Its most conspicuous export to the mainland has been the native rum on which the American liquor stamp tax amounts to approximately $16 million a year. We obligingly collect this tax and then turn right around and give it back, in full, to the Puerto Rican Government.

On the surface, this adds up to paradise all right, but maybe this paradise,

like the one in Genesis, will not last forever.

Though the advertisement does not say so, the present Puerto Rican tax exemption law will provide complete 100 percent exemption only until June 30, 1959, then it will fall rapidly—1 year at 75 percent, 1 year at 50 percent, 1 year at 25 percent, and after June 30, 1962—nothing. But, of course, they can always extend the period, as we do so well here in Congress.

And there have been other doubts cast on the accuracy of the advertisement. When it appeared in the New York Times on January 23, it said in further describing this paradise:

> The swimming, sailing, and fishing are out of this world—and your wife will rejoice to hear that domestic help is abundant.

Only 2 days later, January 25, there appeared in the Washington Post, a George Dixon column entitled "The Big Switch" which said:

> New York's Puerto Rican problem had its genesis in the servant shortage—the ladies of Manhattan yearned so desperately for serf-like nursemaids, scullery maids, cooks, butlers, and general suckers of all work that they began importing Puerto Ricans in clusters, like coconuts—the movement finally reached such proportion that one of the most ironic switches imaginable has come to pass. The Puerto Ricans are now trying to import servants from the Dominican Republic.

So, sadly, we must read Mr. Ruml's advertisement with Mr. Dixon's correction as follows:

> And your wife will rejoice to hear that domestic help is abundant if you can find it in the Dominican Republic.

I think it is time this whole thing is carefully reviewed. There is considerable potential loss of Federal Revenue inherent in this situation. Not only will we lose the tax income from those who emigrate to Puerto Rico, but to the extent that wage and tax advantages there are translated into lower competitive prices, we may find our income from taxes paid by their mainland competitors reduced.

Finally, I am intrigued by Mr. Ruml's sponsorship of such an advertisement. By the ordinary American income taxpayer, he is remembered as the father of "pay as you go," and the withholding tax. Now, to the favored emigrant to Puerto Rico he says, "If you go, you don't have to pay." I confess, I am coming to look with a jaundiced eye at this conception of a taxless Eden, with its twin angels—rum and Ruml.

This is a situation we must watch.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Jacob A. Haller, Jr., and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

TREATY WITH NATIONALIST CHINA

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Executive A, 84th Congress, 1st session, the mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on December 2, 1954, reported it favorably with a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2).

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may be permitted to file its report on the treaty between the United States and the Republic of China during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert Pratt of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George P. Daley, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with reference to the nomination of George P. Daley and its confirmation, I wish to say that we in Minnesota have the highest regard for this very distinguished citizen, who is one of the most prominent citizens of the State in the field of agriculture, and his appointment by the President and his confirmation by the Senate will be all for the public good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of officers for promotion as reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATION OF SENATOR THURMOND TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE ARMY RESERVE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would wish to be recorded as supporting the confirmation of the nominations of all the officers mentioned, save and except himself.

The name of the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina will be found on page 3 of the executive calendar, where he is nominated to be promoted from the rank of colonel to the rank of brigadier general.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have it noted that the Senate is feeling considerable pride in connection with the fact that one of its Members, formerly a colonel in the U. S. Army Reserve, has just been made a brigadier general. I should like to extend my compliments and congratulations to the distinguished Senator and to the great State of South Carolina over which he presided so graciously and effectively as its Governor, and which he now represents so ably as its junior Senator.

The entire Senate, I am certain, joins with me in expressing its pride and gratification in the fact that this fine Senator and splendid public servant in time of peace has found occasion to stay active in the Army Reserve until he now has attained the rank of Brigadier General.

Incidentally, I think we all know, with pride, that Senator Thurmond is at this time the president of the Association

of the Reserve Officers of the United States.

I wish to express my own pride and pleasure, and I feel certain that all other Senators will wish to join with me in that expression.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as the acting minority leader, I claim the privilege of expressing for all Members on this side of the aisle our satisfaction and joy in joining in the confirmation of the nomination of our new colleague from South Carolina. The junior Senator from South Carolina is in many ways a remarkable freshman Senator. He brings to the Senate not only a wonderful career, but also a very interesting election tradition. We look for great things from him.

So far as I am concerned, I observe that the junior Senator from South Carolina has replaced me physically in the office I have occupied for four years. I hope, in reverse, that I may thus get some inspiration from that relationship.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED FAVORABLY AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the confirmation of the nominations of George N. Anderson and 688 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were reported favorably by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] from the Committee on Armed Services, and were received by the Senate on January 21, 1955. The nominations were ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk in order to avoid duplicate printing.

Is there objection to the confirmation of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The Senate resumed legislative business.

THE FARM BLOC DIEHARDS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent, highly pertinent editorial entitled "The Farm Bloc Diehards," published in today's New York Times.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the position taken in this excellent article by this leading newspaper, I wish to quote with particular approval the last two sentences of the editorial, as follows:

> While the fantastic farm surplus accumulated over the past few years is an economic burden on the Nation and a vexing problem to the Government, it has at least one compensating virtue. It is not only a standing monument to the folly of those responsible for the policy of high, rigid price supports, but a warning of what might be expected to follow a return to that disastrous program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

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

THE FARM BLOC DIEHARDS

When the Senate voted 49–44 last August to substitute flexible farm price supports for the rigid 90 percent supports obtaining in the Nation's so-called "basic" farm commodities it marked the culmination of one of the most difficult and important struggles in the entire legislative program of the Eisenhower administration. It meant the scrapping, at long last, of the machinery that had been set up to meet the emergency created by World War II and to which short-sighted farm bloc leaders in Congress had clung ever since as a vested interest with all the tenacity and strength at their command. It meant a return to the apparatus that had been employed previous to the war and to which the Congress had contemplated a return 2 years after the war came to an end.

The fact that the process of wartime overstimulation of production was maintained long after the need for it had passed is reflected in the mountain of surplus farm commodities that has backed up into Government hands in these post-war years. Only now has it been possible even to make a beginning in the complicated and time-consuming task of reducing this enormous hoard from its present level of roughly $7 billions.

But the leaders of the farm bloc are still not reconciled, apparently, to the fact that the war is over. Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina made a speech from the floor at the end of last week calling for the restoration of rigid price supports "for the next 3 years" and has introduced a bill which would have that effect. A companion measure, sponsored by Representative COOLEY, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, is already before that committee. Senator YOUNG, as few readers will be surprised to note, is cosponsoring a similar measure with Senator RUSSELL of Georgia.

There is little reason to believe that these exponents of a discredited cause will succeed in reversing last year's historic return to sanity on the issue of price supports. While the fantastic farm surplus accumulated over the past few years is an economic burden on the Nation and a vexing problem to the Government, it has at least one compensating virtue. It is not only a standing monument to the folly of those responsible for the policy of high, rigid price supports, but a warning of what might be expected to follow a return to that disastrous program.

VIEWS ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, as we listened to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] address the Senate, many of us in the Chamber rose to express our general agreement with the thesis of his argument and with the observation he was making in reference to the reduction of our Armed Forces in this hour of tension and crisis. I wish to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to make observations upon some developments which have concerned me as, I am certain, they have concerned others.

The foreign policy of the United States is not a partisan affair; at least, it should not be. The defense of this Nation should be the responsibility, the privilege, and the duty of all.

I think each and every one of us is hoping and praying that the policy of our Government will lead to peace—peace with honor and peace with freedom. But I think we would be derelict in our responsibilities if we did not, at least, wish to make a constructive analysis of what has been transpiring and, at least, some pertinent observations as to what the future may offer. I think it is fair to say that none of us can safely predict the future, but we can certainly learn from the past and thereby have some guidance for the future.

My first observation is that it was natural and to be expected that following World War II there would be a desire in this Nation for a reduction in our Armed Forces and a return to what has so traditionally been called normalcy. Of course, we all know that following any war there is no such thing as normalcy, and there is no such period to return to.

But from 1946 through 1949 we witnessed in this Nation, not as a matter of political policy alone, but as a matter of desire on the part of the American people, a substantial reduction—yes, an almost crucial reduction—in the military strength of the United States of America. We dedicated our efforts toward the economic rehabilitation of our allies, and then toward the compassionate use of our goods and services, even to those who had been our enemies.

Then we recall that period when we settled down to the overall economic strengthening of the NATO nations, the nations of Western Europe; and finally the extension of economic and military assistance to friendly nations all around the globe.

I desire the record to be clear that despite all the tortures and sacrifices of the war in Korea, the disappointment of the war in Korea, and the disappointment of many persons in the manner of its conclusion, I think it is fair to say that the Soviet Union made a mistake in North Korea. It is true to say at this hour that because of the tragedy of Korea, the American people were alerted to the danger in the world, and we set about the task, late as it was, to build the strength of this Nation. It was the war in Korea which compelled us to strengthen our Air Force, to expand and

strengthen our Army, and to rehabilitate and revitalize our Navy. Then, at long last, the American people and their Government were in a position to back up their diplomacy with power.

Negotiation on the part of a free country, such as ours, is dependent upon maximum strength, strength which is clearly understood by friend and foe alike. That strength must be not only in our own country and our own people, but also in our allies. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that the great Western alliance nations, the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, be further strengthened in every way in which it is humanly possible. It is very important that we try to bring into the circle of our friends and into the orbit of freedom more and more peoples, and to bind them together in a common defense, in collective security, in a compact or a series of compacts, which will provide the maximum amount of strength for one and all.

But what has been happening? Following the truce in Korea, which was longed for by the American people—I shall not discuss its terms, because the truce in Korea is a subject of sharp debate and difference of opinion—following the truce in Korea, immediate moves were taken by the United States Government, on the basis that some kind of peace had been arrived at to reduce the strength of this Nation's Armed Forces. This was done in the name of economy, in the name of balancing the budget, in the name of deficit financing. As the Senator from Missouri has pointed out, the military policy of this country has changed as much as 5 or 6 times in the past year. For example, 2 years ago we saw a drastic cut in the Air Force. Last year we saw an admission of the mistake and the replenishing of the funds. The only result of that policy was to lose time in production and contract authorization, and thereby place us further behind in the buildup of our air power and air strength.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the statement made by the Secretary of Defense, he stated that expenditures in the Military Establishment this year will be reduced by $1,750,000,000. In other words, he does not intend to spend one billion three quarters of a million dollars of the money which has been appropriated by the Congress. He has not stated where he will put those reductions into effect. Would not the Senator from Minnesota agree that the only way he could obtain such reductions would be, one, by impounding the money appropriated by the Congress, or, two, planning, with the civilian secretaries of the three services, deliberate slippages in the military program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct. I may say that once before, in another administration, we had an instance of certain money appropriated by the Congress for the Air Force being impounded and held back for the purposes of contract and buildup of airpower. Without intending to make any party reference at all, such action is a mistake. We ought to have learned that lesson from the previous sacrifices and the previous difficulties that we have had in this area of military strength.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will not the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that the impounding by the President of the moneys in 1948 and 1949 appropriated by the Congress for the Air Force was far different from the apparent impounding of money this time by the Secretary of Defense, who at the same time does not say which service is going to come up with the enforced savings?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I say there is considerable difference.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what I have said thus far may well be termed a preface to what I wish to say now in terms of the immediate, or at least the recent and contemporary, period. We witnessed a certain program at the Geneva Conference. Prior to that conference there was a meeting in Berlin, at which time our Government joined with France in extending an invitation to a conference at Geneva for the purpose of a discussion of the Indochinese war and its settlement. I recognize that our representatives were working under severe pressure, particularly from our ally France, and undoubtedly also from our ally, Britain, the British Empire, and its representatives. But I state here again, as I have stated publicly throughout the country, that the American degree of participation in the Geneva Conference was beneath the dignity of the country in terms of the kind of leadership we should have extended. Out of that conference came a settlement of the Indochina fighting. It is our hope that something can be salvaged from that agreement. We are sending to that area a former chief of staff, General Collins. He is being assigned to South Vietnam to strengthen that country so it can stay free.

Mr. President, I used this example of Geneva for a purpose which will soon be obvious. In recent months we have viewed the failure of the European defense treaty, that failure taking place in the French Parliament. Following that there was the London agreement, which resulted in a formula for the rearmament of Western Germany. Once the London agreement was presented to the respective parliaments, it had to be subjected to difficult debate and decision. The Government of France, under Mendes-France, finally was able to get through the Chamber of Deputies, by a close vote, the ratification of that aspect of the London agreement which pertained to the rearmament of Western Germany. That Government of France has fallen, and France finds itself in a very unfortunate and most indecisive position.

Mr. President, I think the Members of the Senate should remember that for months the Soviet Union, through its leadership, has been preparing the Soviet people for war. There has been a change in Russia's propaganda which, if not brought to the attention of the Senate, should have been. I have seen it again and again in reports I have read from scholars of Soviet propaganda. But there has been little information to those of us who have to share in the making of these policy decisions.

I repeat, for over 5 months the Soviet people have been conditioned to what happened today in the meeting of the two houses of the Soviet Parliament. If anyone has any doubt about that fact at all, I invite him to examine the propaganda which has been fed to the people of the Soviet Union.

Further, we have witnessed the Soviet Union threats on the Germans, the French, and the British, that they would break their alliances and treaties if those countries were to yield to what Russia called American leadership and American advocacy of Western German rearmament. It is to the credit of France, England, and Chancellor Adenauer of Western Germany, and the coalition that he has, that thus far they have stood firm.

Make no mistake, while threats and intimidation have been going on, something else has been happening. The Soviet Union has offered a peace treaty within the last month to Japan. Russia has made repeated offerings and solicitations to the Western Germans for the unification of West and East Germany. I believe what is going on in the Far East is all part of a general strategy that has been laid down from the Kremlin carefully and precisely, just as I am confident that the attack of the North Koreans upon South Korea was masterminded by the Soviets. That plan misfired. Russia's objective was not realized. The attack was stopped, and Russia's whole purpose of being able to encircle Japan, cut it off, and finally take it into its orbit, and move into Japan was checked by the timely resistance of the American Armed Forces and the action of the United Nations. We received help from some our allies in the United Nations, together with the valiant service and courage of the men, women, and troops of South Korea.

In September—at the very time when there was talk of the London agreements and when there was talk of the Manila pact—we witnessed the attacks on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. That was a step-up of what might be called the cold war by intimidation and violence. All the time these attacks are occurring, we see the Soviet Union using every trick in its black kit of treachery, which is a part of its diplomacy, to intimidate our friends in Western Europe.

Recently our country has been brought to believe that the major question before the whole world is Formosa. Mr. President, do not misunderstand me; I voted for the Formosan joint resolution. I had some doubts as to all its implications; but I resolved those doubts in terms of faith in our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and also in terms of the vital need of

our country, namely, the security of the United States.

But, Mr. President, although Formosa is an important part of the defense line of our country, I repeat here what I have said privately to friends and publicly to audiences and in conferences with radio, newspaper, and television people, namely, that the grand prize of Soviet strategy—today, tomorrow, and next month—is Western Germany: Germany, with her air power; Germany, with her millions of people; Germany, with her industrial strength and with her science and technology; Germany, with her central position in Western Europe.

Let me repeat as a warning, this afternoon, Mr. President, that today Germany is in a more precarious situation, in terms of her affiliation with the West, than she has been at any other time in recent years. Today the government of Chancellor Adenauer is weaker than it was last week. If all my colleagues do not know it, let them read the press of Germany. If we do that, we shall find that today the strength Chancellor Adenauer had a year ago is slowly being whittled away. I rise now to pay tribute to that great man, who has been our friend, and who has been a stanch friend of freedom throughout his life. But today his power is weak, and it was not helped by the collapse of the French Government of Mendes-France.

I repeat that today the Soviets are pressing, with every means at their command, to have the eyes of America turned to the east, while they pick off the plum, the grand prize, of their diplomacy and their maneuverings, namely, to have a neutral Germany, which the Russians hope then would turn toward the east, in line with a Germany's traditional trade pattern. Mr. President, we need to be students of history. Germany has always traded with the east, and she has had some common interest with Russia in the east, in the past. Today, there is in Germany a large bloc of persons who have been advocating a neutral Germany—and I am not referring to the Social Democrats alone, who are a political party. Instead, I am speaking of the great industrialists and of a former Chancellor of Germany, Mr. Brüning, who only last summer, when speaking to a group of industrial leaders, assembled in Dusseldorf, the capital of the great German industrial combines, said it was Germany's destiny to be a balance between the west and the east. So he called upon Germany to be a vital neutral.

Mr. President, I ask anyone in America: Today, with France as uncertain as she is, with France torn by dissension and by instability of government, what is going to happen to the Western European alliance if Germany is removed from the orbit of the nations who believe in freedom?

Italy has done well; and we love the Italian people, and we admire the stand of their government. But, Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it: Italy is a weak reed, as compared with the thundering, massive power Germany is able to demonstrate today. The most phenomenal recovery ever to occur on the face of the earth, in view of what has happened to the nation concerned, has been made by Western Germany; her recovery is almost unbelievable. Today her industrial production is far above her production schedule. Germany represents a tremendous power for good or for evil. A neutral Germany, which could play off the East against the West, could well destroy the western alliance system of freedom and security.

So, Mr. President, I warn my colleagues and the country; and I do so, not in a spirit of acrimony, but in a spirit of prayer and hope: Keep your eyes on Western Europe, and keep your eyes on Japan. They are the prizes in their respective, opposite areas, among all the prizes on the face of the globe. How paradoxical that is, Mr. President, in view of the fact that those two countries are former enemies of ours, and are the two nations which caused so much bloodshed and so much trouble. But, Mr. President, honestly, they are the two nations on the face of the earth, second only to the United States and Great Britain, which represent industrial power and manpower and technological ability and a willingness to stand up and be counted.

At this very hour, the new government of Japan—and, Mr. President, by the way, the government of Japan has changed. Not long ago we honored the former prime minister of Japan, by having him speak to us, here in the Senate. However, when he returned from Washington, D. C., to Japan, he lost his power in the Japanese Diet, I would remind my colleagues; he had been home less than a month, when he was ousted from office. So I would say that his visit to the United States may have made him popular here, but it did not help him there. At this very hour, efforts are being made by the Soviets to seduce the Japanese Government, by offering the Japanese Government trade concessions. The Soviets seek to get their trade "nose" into the Japanese tent; and the Soviets also wish to make some kind of working arrangement with the Japanese, so as to keep the Japanese from being an effective, participating partner with the West, namely, the United States and our allies.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am much impressed with the presentation being made by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, in his discussion of the growing dangers incident to advancing Communist aggression all over the world, especially in many countries which we in America believe are our allies.

Nevertheless, it is true, as the junior Senator from Minnesota has so ably stated, that in Germany, in Japan, in France, and in other countries, communism is advancing, both internally and externally, because of pressures which are put on some of those countires, seductions in the form of favorable trade offers, and so forth.

I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota whether he believes that by cutting our military appropriations, month after month, during the last few years, we are, and have been, very possibly responsible for many of the successes, both internally and externally, made by the Soviet conspiracy in some of the countries to which he has referred. Do not they feel we are not serious in our determination to resist communism, when it is pointed out to them that we are steadily reducing our own military strength?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I am confident in my own mind—and, of course, one can speak only for himself, and from his own limited experience and ability—that surely these reductions have not added to our prestige, nor have they bolstered our efforts at diplomacy, in trying to strengthen our position and the position of our allies.

The effect has all been negative, so to speak. I develop that point by pointing out that I think one of the biggest mistakes that has been made was in the April conference in 1953 of the NATO powers, following the Lisbon Conference of April 1952. At the conference in April 1953—I believe my chronology is correct—instead of the United States representatives insisting that our allies meet their goals, instead of our keeping a tight hold on the situation, what we said was that there was no dateline for preparedness; that there was no real urgency; that we would do certain things in good time.

Why did we say that? Because it cost us less money to say it. It meant that we could string out for a longer period of time the military and economic assistance, rather than arriving at certain goals by a particular date and sustaining those goals for an indefinite period of time thenceforth. I can frankly state, from my point of view, that once we were willing to say to our European friends that they could take things a little easier, they really wanted to take it easy. That is understandable. They had borne the full brunt of the war and the devastation of fire and bomb. Their peoples were restive under heavy taxation, lack of consumer goods, and the lack of housing which was everywhere evident. They were delighted to be able to release more of their productive capacity in terms of what might be called soft goods, consumer goods. They were delighted to have someone say, "You can ease off a bit."

Since that time we have had some trouble. I point out that while, of course, it was good public relations to make such announcements, and to enter upon such a policy, it may very well not have been good, sound political and diplomatic relations, because the task of leadership is to ask people who work with us to do more than they expected to do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator mentioned diplomatic relations. Would he not say that the only possibility of success of our diplomats in negotiating with the Soviet Communists is to be able to negotiate from a position of relative military strength?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, as we have steadily reduced our military appropriations in the past 2 years, have we not, in effect, been playing into the hands of the Soviet leaders?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my opinion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We know that the soldiers on Formosa, equipped with American equipment and trained by American officers, are not going to stay there, under these circumstances, forever. If we do not reverse our policy and follow the policy suggested by the Senator this afternoon, building up our military strength, will not the same results ultimately occur in countries like Japan, and very possibly Western Germany, that have already happened to the disadvantage of the free world in these other countries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that will be the situation. At least that is my belief. Perhaps the word "sure" is too positive. However, the facts so indicate.

Mr. President, prior to the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri and myself, I was speaking of what I felt was the "grand prize," to use the vernacular, in the struggle between the totalitarian Communist area and the free world. I repeat that it is Western Germany at this hour.

This does not mean that we should not be interested in the defense of Formosa. Indeed we must be. I say, however, that this is all a matter of emphasis, perspective, and weighted importance. Surely we have done what needed to be done in drawing the line in Formosa, and saying that was vital to the interests of the security of the United States. But I do not want the policy of our Government, as expressed by executive officers, to be so totally affixed to the Far East that we forget the immediate design of the Soviets in the West.

There are some factors which I think should be discussed in this connection.

Mr. President, I should like to complete an analysis I was trying to make of conditions and problems with which we are confronted. I stated earlier that these matters are of serious import. I lay no claim to expert knowledge. However, there seem to be some areas which can stand some review.

I said it has been the policy of this country since 1950 to defend Formosa. There is no doubt about it. I was pleased to hear the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] clarify the record again.

What is important about Formosa can be placed in two areas. What about the Formosans, whom no one seems to talk about? There are quite a number of people in Formosa who are Formosans.

Second, Mr. President, what is important for the vital interests of the United States of America? Chiang Kai-shek is incidental. I repeat—incidental, and, in this instance, accidental. I would not feel it was my duty or right by any vote of mine to commit one man or woman, one boy or girl, in this country to the defense of Chiang Kai-shek. But I do feel, as a member of the United States Senate, that I have an obligation, a moral responsibility, and a patriotic duty to face up to the responsibilities, no matter how difficult they may be, in connection with the defense of the vital interests and the security of the United States of America. That is what we are here for. Every vote we cast can be justified only on that basis. We are not running a social welfare agency or a retrieving club for deposed leaders. We have but one obligation—our Nation. That may include the closest alliance with other people. It may, because of the moral foundations of our society, compel us to be interested in the welfare of our brothers. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. There are many good Scriptural passages which would fit into my remarks, such as the story of Cain and Abel—"Am I my brother's keeper?"

When I took my oath of office before the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and stood in solemn attention, I swore to defend and protect the interests of the United States of America. That is the way we should justify treaties, resolutions, or anything else on which we pass here. I do not think it is in the interest of the United States of America to be getting ourselves into what General Bradley so well and aptly referred to as the wrong war in the wrong country at the wrong time with the wrong enemy.

Red China is like a substation compared with the master powerhouse of the Kremlin. The switches of Soviet control are not in Peiping. They are running on low wattage there. The center of Communist power is in the Kremlin, and we had better keep our eyes not only on Charley McCarthy in this instance, but on Edgar Bergen. I hope Mr. Bergen will forgive me for this analogy. We had better keep our eyes on the center of the stage rather than on the blinds around the sides. This does not mean that we should not pay any attention to diversionary actions. To be sure, we do; but we should also pay attention to the attitudes of the people in the Far East. We are committed, whether it be good or bad, to an alliance with the present leadership on Formosa. That has developed to a point where there is no backing out. But I would have the record of the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee read by every Senator in this Chamber. How many countries does any Senator think are desirous of associating with that leadership, to associate by treaty, by alliance, by mutual security pacts, or collective security pacts? I shall not name the number; I shall only say that it is very, very small. All our major allies in the world, what allies we have, are favoring a policy in the Far East with which we do not agree. So the only force we have in the Far East with which we agree is the only force in the Far East that has no other ally. I say that is a most unfortunate position, but that is the position in which we find ourselves.

That tells me that we had better limit our operations in that area to one purpose, namely, the interests of the United States of America, in the interest of stopping Communist aggression which, if it continues, could seriously jeopardize our whole security.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall ask to continue for a moment, and then I shall be glad to yield.

That is why, Mr. President, I was concerned about becoming too involved in the offshore islands. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] voted differently from the Senator from Minnesota. But there is no secret about the fact that Chiang Kai-shek wants to go back to the mainland, and he wants us to put him back there. There is no secret about it, in my mind, and I do not wish to help him. Why? Because I do not wish to see the Chinese Nationalists become the supreme power on the Chinese mainland? Not at all. I think any government on the Chinese mainland that had any modicum of respect for the institutions of freedom would be better than the Communist Government. But I do not want to see the American people caught in the Soviet trap. The Russian bear is setting a trap for the American people, in China. If we get ourselves sucked into that vast area with our manpower, our economic resources, our trained military forces, the Soviet Union will have a happy hunting ground throughout the rest of the world while we are battling with the huge masses of humanity which the Chinese Communist war lords and dictators can rally against us.

Defend Formosa? Yes. Meet the aggressor at any place? Yes. Defend our manpower, our vital installations, and our fleet? Yes. But do all this with calmness and courage, and do it all with steadfastness and extreme caution. I think we need calm courage and persevering patience. I think we need sustained strength. What we have too much of is sporadic treatment of international developments, getting concerned on one day and then wishing to lean back and say that it looks very good on the next day. We have not had competent courage. We have had the kind of youthful courage that comes every time someone shakes his fist at us. We have not had persevering patience. In fact, we have been very impatient; and we have not had sustained strength. The U. S. S. *Missouri* is the pride of the fleet one month, and is in mothballs the next month. The First Marine Division is in Korea when it is peaceful and quiet, and now that we are evacuating the Tachens, and it looks like there will be trouble in Formosa, they are coming home.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not in a spirit of criticism, but as a statement of fact, Does the Senator know any country in Europe or in the Orient where our position has materially improved in the past 2 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Philippine Islands, I would say, our traditional ally.

I would hope we are a bit better off in Italy; but if the Senator wishes to know whether, in the overall, we are better off, I would say I doubt it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would agree with the Senator as to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are probably in worse relationship with India.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With reference to Italy, which I had the opportunity of visiting with the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire last spring, I believe the question of our relations with Italy may well depend upon the decision made by the head of the Socialist Party, the Moscow trained Mr. Nenni, as to whether he does or does not intend to join the Communist Party headed by Mr. Togliatti. There are many countries with whom our relationship has deteriorated and our position has been materially reduced. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At the same time, is it not true, that those countries have watched us constantly reducing the military strength from which we could have negotiated with them, and their possible enemies, and our possible enemies?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is true.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think signs of weakness can only lead to a further diminution of our position of influence and leadership in the world.

Mr. President, within recent weeks an attempt was made by our Government and other governments, through the United Nations, to arrive at a cease-fire in Formosa. I presented a resolution in the Senate at the time we adopted the resolution on Formosa. My resolution carried out the other 50 percent of the President's message on the critical situation in the Strait of Formosa and off the coast of the Chinese mainland. My colleagues may recall that the President endorsed the efforts of the United Nations to seek a cease-fire arrangement. He said the position of our country was one of seeking peace; and the President is a man who seeks peace.

My resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it was discussed in the committee. Mr. President, I regret to say that my resolution was not reported by the committee. I am here to make the record clear that the reason why it was not reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was that certain Senators and forces in the committee felt that a cease-fire proposal by the United States Senate might result in appeasement.

My answer to those particular Senators was that if any appeasement was to be done at the United Nations, it would have to be done by this administration, because the foreign policy of the United States Government is in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State. Many Senators may think they are the Secretary of State, but they are not; the foreign policy of this country is in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State. Frequently the Senate is asked for advice and consent; most of the time we give only consent, not advice.

If there was to have been any appeasement, I may mention to my colleagues, on the basis of the United Nations action in seeking a cease-fire, appeasement could only have come as the result of an order of the administration forwarded to those who represent us in the United Nations. Our representatives in that organization hold their positions by appointment of the President of the United States and follow the policy established by the President and the Secretary of State.

I was shocked to hear some of my Republican colleagues on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations state that they thought my resolution might result in appeasement, when, as a matter of fact, the President of the United States is responsible for the foreign policy of this Nation. I have more faith in our President than they have. I did not vote for the President, but I have more faith in him than to think that he would appease. I was literally shocked to find some of the leaders of the Republican Party—in fact, the minority leader of the Republican Party himself—concerned about the fact that the United Nations resolution we were considering, and the whole discussion on cease fire, might lead to untimely concessions to and ultimate appeasement of the Chinese Communist forces.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that at the time the Korean truce was entered into, some persons in public life were urging that it would be, in effect, absurd to enter into a truce in Korea upon the basis on which the truce was being entered into?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I recall such statements being made right here in the Senate.

Mr. LONG. There are some today who say we never should have agreed to a truce in Korea, are there not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and those same some, while on the one hand they regret the truce, point with justifiable political pride to the fact that the truce was concluded. They attempt to play both sides of the street.

Mr. LONG. If we are ever to arrive at a time when the shooting in the Chinese civil war in the Strait of Formosa will be stopped, and our forces and the enemy forces can be disengaged, there will have to be some negotiating again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LONG. Does it seem apparent to the Senator that perhaps we are appeasing some of our so-called friends by committing this Nation to a position which will make it very difficult for us ever to arrive at a possible settlement, honorably agreed to both by us and by those who oppose us today?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The perception of the junior Senator from Louisiana is exceeded only by his intellect and his knowledge of the situation. How right the Senator is. It is more important to have a united free world than it is to have a united political party. I think the duty of the administration is to achieve as much unity as is possible among our allies, and to rely upon the good sense and judgment of patriotic Senators to rally around the cause. We do not really need a united Republican Party or a united Democratic Party. We need enough people in both parties to see the need of strength to back up the free nations of the world. If there were less effort to appease within the local political framework, and more effort directed toward a more firm foreign policy, a policy which would yield strength, we would make considerably more progress.

I am one who believes, as I have said before, that our action in the Far East must be one of prudent caution, but also one of courage and determination.

Why do I make these statements? Because I am afraid there are some forces in the United States who feel that the only way in which Asia can be saved is to have a war on the Chinese mainland. I suggest to those persons that the Soviet Union and international communism, which sees great opportunities within Asia for Communist expansion, know full well that if the Soviet is to be a world power, convincing in its industry, its stability, and its economic ability, it must have, at least, a neutral Germany and a neutral Japan. So, as I have said, we ought to keep our eyes on the main scene.

I wish to make 1 or 2 further observations. I believe we must persist in the United Nations in the policy upon which we have set our course. I believe the United Nations offers to the United States the best opportunity in which to gain some sense of stability and tranquillity in the Asian area.

I know that we cannot act alone in that area. Not only do we not have strong allies in Asia, but we are constantly weakening ourselves among our allies in the European area. The farther we go with unilateral action, the more steps we take on our own with a weak partner alongside us; namely, only the Chinese Nationalist leadership, the more and more trouble we shall have in Asia, and the fewer friends we shall have in Europe.

It does us no good to say that we are disgusted with the people of India or with Mr. Nehru. The fact is that the Government of India represents the largest single democracy in the world, in terms of numbers. Mr. Nehru was elected by the people of India; but Chiang Kai-shek was never elected in Formosa. There has not been a national election in Formosa since the day the forces of Nationalist China landed there.

We find it easy to get along with the Nationalist Government of China on Formosa, but we find it difficult to get along with the leadership of India.

I am not taking up the cudgels for Mr. Nehru, his policies, or even his eccentricities. It is more important that the United States have a working, friendly relationship with India than it is to be bludgeoned by some political forces into a form of inflexible policy regarding Nationalist China. What we need to do is to be practical in our judgments.

To me the United Nations proposition to seek a cease-fire is the honorable, the sound, proposal that we need. I do not think we should act like a postman and renew it every week, but I think it should be left standing to show our good intentions, our wish for peace, and our willingness to talk about any pertinent matter.

Why do I say this? Because I am of the opinion that there are moves underway right now on the international scene to get us off into another one of these side conferences. If we get into another one of these international conferences outside the U. N., it will be an international conference or movement started by the Soviet Union, India, Great Britain, or perhaps 1 or 2 other countries. What are the chances of the United States of America and its policies receiving very much support in such an atmosphere? They would be negligible. I say our chances of getting a reasonably good settlement in the United Nations are infinitely better.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to show me in the record a case in which the United States has ever suffered a defeat of its policies in the U. N. I ask them to show me where in a substantive and procedural matter we have not had an overwhelming majority of the members of the U. N. on our side. The only way the Soviet Union is able to trip us up on international diplomacy is when they get us out in some sideshow, in another international conference. There are persons who have condemned the United Nations as if it were a den of treason, when, in fact, it has been the best forum for American policy and action we have ever had. Soviet propaganda may be able to fool some people, but Soviet propaganda has not even won a single substantive and procedural issue in the United Nations. I think that is very good batting for the United Nations. That fact shows that when there are present persons of knowledge, experience, and background, the hoax, the fraud, and the hypocrisy of the Soviet propagandists are fully exposed and thereby not accepted. So I hope our Government will continue to pursue whatever course toward peaceful actions it seeks through the counsels of the United Nations. Furthermore, we are not estopped in the United Nations just because a veto power exists in the Security Council. We were able to amend the rules of the General Assembly so that we can take our problems to the General Assembly and, by a majority vote in the General Assembly, work out an effective program of collective security or collective action. That change in rules occurred as a result of the Korean war. The Soviet Union made a big mistake once of walking out of the Security Council. Just about a month after it walked out of the Security Council, lo and behold, the Security Council acted, which was the only time it so acted, with decision, dispatch, and definiteness when we presented the case of North Korean aggression. By unanimous vote, the Security Council voted North Korea to be the aggressor, and ordered collective action by the United Nations.

The Soviet Union quickly returned to the fold after it made that mistake, but former Secretary of State Acheson set about devising a plan whereby the veto power of the Security Council could be bypassed. He conceived a program and plan in the General Assembly whereby, even with the Soviet veto of sensible proposals in the Security Council, a proposal still could be gotten to the General Assembly, and action could be taken.

I only repeat, I hope and pray, and I believe, it is the policy of our Government to pursue, through the councils of the United Nations, whatever course of action may be desired in its objectives.

I warn our Government to beware of being enticed into international conferences under the wrong auspices, because if we should be so enticed, we would be likely to lose our shirt, as is said in some parts of the country. It would not be so bad if it were just our shirt that we would lose.

Mr. President, while attacks on Quemoy and Matsu are being made, and there exists a critical situation in the Formosan Straits, while all the blustering, the threats, and the intimidation of the Soviet Union are going on, what else do we see? We have witnessed changes in Soviet policy. After the death of Marshal Stalin, there were those persons who let the wish be the father of the thought in the hope that the Soviet would change. They hoped for such a change so much that they were almost willing to believe whatever propaganda came out of the Kremlin. To me that is a demonstration of immaturity and a lack of understanding of international communism.

Communism is not a person; it is an ideal, a system, an ideology, backed up by powerful forces and brute strength. Stalin could die 10 times, and that fact would not change what international communism is. Mr. Malenkov, Mr. Bulganin, and Mr. Khrushchev could die, and it would not change international communism. In communism there is a design for conquest. Literally an orthodox mechanism of political power has been developed. Those that run it are incidental except insofar as they are in control of the political apparatus. But many wanted to believe that the Soviet Union was going to become more peaceful. That was a good excuse for cutting the budget. Some of us in the Senate rose and warned repeatedly that the bear may change its head, but it never changes its disposition. The bear may change its strategy and tactics, but it never changes its objectives.

Not only that, but actually sometimes the Soviet Union gives us a lot of information about what it is going to do. Not once, but half a dozen times, this Senator has mentioned the 19th international congress of the Communist Party in Moscow in the month of September 1952. The congress was held while we were holding a national election here. Not many persons paid much attention to it. Even in that congress of the Communist leaders of the world, some of the objectives of communism were laid down. Marshal Stalin said at that time, which was just a few months before his death, that the No. 1 objective of the Soviet Union was to divide the United States from its allies. That objective has never been erased. The second man to speak at that congress was Malenkov. It was pointed out that an effort would be made to have an economic war entered into between the United States and its allies. Knowing that our trade picture was somewhat uncertain, knowing that our allies needed trade, and knowing that we in America were less desirous of having world trade, what did the administration do? When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should have been extended for 3 to 5 years, instead it was extended for only 1 year. We had people in high places promising that if the act was extended, nothing would be done under the act. A leading official of this Government said, "If you will extend the act for 1 year, we give you our word we will not do anything with the act or under the act."

I delivered a speech in the Senate in which I pointed out that the Soviet Union had signed over 40 trade agreements, and we had yet to sign but one. We wanted to believe that Russia was going to be more peace-loving, and there was all kinds of talk about coexistence. There was talk about the Soviet Union's having internal trouble. The Soviet Union has internal trouble, but they do not stand there talking about it. Those who cause internal trouble are liquidated. We do not do that. That is one big difference between a police State and a democracy.

Then we heard that the Soviet Union had to do something more about the production of consumer goods; and Mr. Malenkov had, as one of his programs, eased the economic pressures—in terms of consumer goods—upon the people. I think that was understandable, following the death of Stalin. Perhaps Malenkov had read a little about American politics, and had read a little, perhaps, to the effect that it is a good idea once in a while to sort of firm up yourself with your constituents. So a program of improved agriculture was at least announced to the world, and it was accompanied by the appointment of key Soviets to key positions—all in an effort to see that those things happened.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it is very interesting to observe that although we in the United States have been having a row about too much agricultural production and about our more productive and abundant agriculture, as if those things were the curse of our time, the Soviet Union has had as its major problem the failure of Russian agriculture to produce. So perhaps we should be grateful that our farm people have been able to meet production quotas, and then some; and we did not need any commissar to get them to do it, either. They were willing to do it on the basis of their own ability and capacity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask my colleague to permit me to pursue this thought for a moment, please.

Mr. President, within recent weeks we have heard of another change. I wish to say that what happened today, in terms of the new dictator of the Soviet Union, should not have been unexpected. If we would only exercise as much foresight as we exercise hindsight, we would all be a lot better off by a darn sight, as someone has said. [Laughter.] For the past year there have been, in some of the European journals, and also in the American press, comments to the effect that a man by the name of Khrushchev seemed to be coming into power in Soviet Russia. In the last week, one of the leading American publications stated that although it is true that Mr. Khrushchev has been traveling around a great deal, and has been making addresses in Indochina and in Siberia, and has been attending the big meetings, yet Mr. Malenkov has just been letting him do all of that. Of course, Mr. President, such an arrangement may work in the United States, but in a dictatorship it is seldom that more than one person takes a bow at any one time. We heard continuously that a new force was coming into being in the Soviet Union—or, at least, that a new personality was coming into being there. This morning we learn from the newspapers that that personality has come to the forefront.

Mr. President, I should like to say a word or two about that personality. The man behind that man is Mr. Khrushchev; he is the one who is behind Marshal Bulganin. Who is Marshal Bulganin? Well, lest anyone have any doubts about it, Marshal Bulganin is not what might be called a regular military officer. Instead, he is a political-military officer. He was used by Marshal Stalin to police the armed forces of Soviet Russia—the Red army. Marshal Bulganin was the chief political commissar of the Red Army. He represents both the military and the Communist Party; both of them are represented in his one person. He has held a number of positions during the last 10 years; he is not new. He has been in official positions in the Soviet Government; and at times he has been in nonofficial positions, as an adviser on defense matters to the Central Politburo. Marshal Bulganin represents political control over the military establishment; and he is backed up by Mr. Khrushchev, who represents full control over the political establishment. When the political party and the military are united in one person, under a dictatorship, that shows the existence of about as close to a perfect police-state apparatus as could be obtained.

Furthermore, Marshal Bulganin is said to be a former member of the Russian secret police. He knows the policies of liquidation and the means thereof. So he is not only the master politician, and the political-military boss, but he incorporates in his person some of the talents of the late but not lamented—and I emphasize that he is not lamented—Beria, who was liquidated.

Mr. President, what does this mean to us? I suppose we can only engage in conjecture. Certainly we should have more information. As a Member of the Senate, I should like to know what our Government knows about these matters. As a Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to see what some of the scholars of Soviet propaganda and Soviet policy have to say about these things. How can we legislate properly if all we hear is what the Secretary of State wants to tell us? As one Member of the Senate, I have received communications from persons who told me, 2 months before Mr. Beria was liquidated, that he was on the block, ready for liquidation. Before the name of Khrushchev was in the American press to any great degree, one scholar of Soviet propaganda said to some of us who serve in the Senate, "Watch out for the rise of the Khrushchev star." And within the month, a gentleman who has been kind enough to communicate with me, off and on, about Soviet propaganda and political strategy, told me there was very likely to be a major change in the Soviet Government because of the rise of Mr. Khrushchev and the weakness of Mr. Malenkov.

Just read what Mr. Malenkov had to say, Mr. President. Then we see what is going to happen to him. He is reported as having said, "I admit my guilt and my unsatisfactory leadership."

Mr. President, the Soviet courts save time; the accused pleads guilty early in the proceedings. I will only say that Mr. Malenkov's position is precarious.

The Minister of Consumers Goods Production was removed from his job. Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party, says that all this talk about consumer goods almost borders on treason. That should have been a sign in the wind, should it not?

I am saying this today, Mr. President, only because in the Foreign Relations Committee I have been engaged in hearings, as other members have, for two weeks; and during those hearings I have heard about Chiang Kai-shek, and I have heard about the 350,000 Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa, but I have not heard about what is happening in the greatest military enemy America has ever had, the Soviet Union. Why don't our committees receive information from the State Department or the Central Intelligence Agency, about what is going on? Or are we concentrating all our attention on the morale of the 350,000 troops on Formosa? Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President; that is important too. But I think we have lost ourselves. We have been concentrating on the sideshow, at a time when the main show is ready to change acts.

I think the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations needs a special study committee on Soviet strategy and Soviet tactics. I think we should be calling upon our Government specialists and the scholars in our Nation—and we have plenty of them—who understand Communist tactics. Let us note that when Mr. Khrushchev yesterday walked into the joint session of the Supreme Soviet, he walked at the head of the parade.

In America we have persons who have spent 25 or 30 years studying nothing else than the placement or position of Soviet political personalities in pictures—the placement of certain Soviet political figures in photographs. Those students have noted where those political figures stand at a certain wedding or at someone's funeral, or the position in which they stand the next week in the Red Square, or their position at the time of a review of the Red army. In the United States we have students who understand the placement of various items in various parts of the Soviet newspapers. That may very well tell what is "in the works."

In America there are students in and out of Government who for 25 or 30 years have studied the Soviet language, and the translation of the idiomatic expression of the Russian into the language we read, the English language.

In other words, we not only need military intelligence to spot airfields on maps, but we need analytical intelligence, political intelligence, and understanding of what is going on. I am afraid we have not had quite enough of it in the Congress. This is not unexpected. We are not an old power in the field of diplomacy, but we had better learn fast, because time is running out.

With respect to the Soviet budget, I read in the American press that the Soviets are planning to increase their defense budget by 12 percent. Whom do they think they are kidding? I hope we are not being fooled. What I want to know is, What are the budgets of the satellites—Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Poland, and Hungary? Moreover, how much are the Soviets concealing in the budget, which they are not telling their own people or telling us?

We may very well ask ourselves what we should do at this moment. I think we had better follow some of the advice laid down by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] this afternoon. I know one thing. It does not sound very good for this Senator, on the very next legislative day after he votes for the Formosa resolution, to hear the Secretary of Defense say that Formosa is but a ripple, unless he really means that the attention of our State Department is being concentrated in other parts of the world, or at least a part of its attention.

I cannot put the picture together. I really cannot understand why it is necessary to be so firm and definite about our commitments in a certain area, and then to reduce our military strength.

I also believe that we had better be emphasizing something besides military strength. We cannot afford to be writing off any peoples. It would be very pleasant to know that we had the closest relationship with the people of Burma and the Government of Burma. There is a friendly relationship, but I wish it were better.

Further, I wish to point out that the second largest nation in Asia is India. I for one feel that we must exercise infinite patience, and at times have the boldest programs in that area, so as to enable the Indian people to save themselves from ultimate collapse. Much of this we ought to do through the United Nations Technical and Economic Assistance Program. Some of those nations will not accept our aid unilateral-

ly. But, however it needs to be done, let us do it. Then let us further step up our programs of information, understanding, and education. Let us become the chief exponent of the United Nations and its agencies and activities. The United Nations is located in this country. That gives us a glorious opportunity to talk and work in and for an organization which touches the lives of more people than any organization ever before created by man. Let us not fall into the Soviet trap by weakening the United Nations. Let us not fall into the habit of working our way out into other areas for international negotiation, if it can be avoided.

Mr. President, those are only a few observations. I have had some of these things on my mind for quite a little while, and I thought I would like to say them. I know that the Congress of the United States needs sound information, and needs more of it. I know that the American people need it too. I know that we need to know how strong we really are, and that we are basically a strong people. We ought to know that the leadership requires a knowledge of our own assets and liabilities.

In view of the developments we have seen in recent days, I hope that every effort will be made in the Congress to supplement our information. This is not to say that we should not rely upon that which comes from the executive departments. Indeed, we must. However, I think we would be better serving the American people if we should go out of our way to seek our own avenues of information, to try to find out what we can on our own, and see how our information compares with the official policy laid down by the executive departments. In that way we shall be able to give advice, as well as consent. In that way we shall be able to share the responsibility, rather than having to shoulder some of it without having a voice in the policy. I believe that the only way to bring about such a situation is for some of us to continue talking about the subject and working toward that end.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation and a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was about to yield the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The observation is that I have seldom heard a more penetrating or brilliant analysis of the problems which face the free world today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The question refers back to something which the Senator said about food. As I understand it, the history of the rise and fall of civilizations has been related to their success or lack of success in obtaining food. I also understand that today this country is the most fertile and prosperous country in the history of the world. In connection with the discussion of the question of the free world against the Communist conspiracy, does not the Senator consider it unfortunate that, at the same time we are, in effect, apparently losing some of our allies and some of our position in the free world, instead of producing all the food we can, we are increasing our controls in order to reduce the production of food?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator that the hue and cry that has gone up about our God-given abundance of food, when half the world is barely on a subsistence diet, has never impressed me. I have always considered it false political crocodile tears.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I respect the Senator's opinion especially in this area, because of his great knowledge of the problems of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say also to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that recently he may have read articles in the paper dealing with the fact that the Department of Agriculture at long last has found a way of processing our butter into a product which is very palatable and useful and desirable in various areas of the Far East.

Of course, someone will say that that will cost money. My reply is that it also costs money to send guns abroad, and that those guns may some day be turned against us.

I should like to point out also that processes are available today, which are commercially feasible and commercially proven, by which wheat is converted into a cereal grain which can be used as a substitute for rice, and that that substitute has far more nutritional value and is actually cheaper in cost than the rice.

If we used as much imagination with respect to the use of our God-given abundance of food that we use in complaining about them, we would solve half of our world problems.

I regret that sometimes we get ourselves into a position of "politicking" about this abundance of food. For the life of me I cannot understand why we should complain about a few extra bales of cotton, a few extra gallons of vegetable oil, or a few extra bushels of cereal grains or feed grains, in a world in which food is the primary basic need and deficiency of a majority of the people of the world.

I am pleased by the way our agriculture has performed. It has performed well indeed. Would it not be wonderful if we could get the information behind the Iron Curtain that a free agriculture, composed of family farms, has out-produced in every way the collective agriculture of state planning? Let us make no mistake about the fact that the peasantry of Europe and the great farm people of the United States and of Canada are the backbone of a free society. They are the last ones who yield to the omnipotent power of the totalitarian state.

Stalin found out about it, and history records the fact that even Hitler could never regiment the German farmer.

One of the great assets we have today in the cold war—and it will also be an asset in any hot war we may get into—is the productive capacity and the production in being—just like forces in being, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri—ready and available. That production is not excessive in view of the kind of world we live in.

We may well need that so-called excess food if things get out of hand.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 9, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe, O12263, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Albert Pratt, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission; remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1956.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR TERMS OF 6 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1954

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York.
George P. Daley, of Minnesota.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.), to date from December 8, 1954:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452.
Brig. Gen. Claude Thomas Bowers, O183291.
Brig. Gen. James Francis Cantwell, O396657.
Brig. Gen. Clyde Emerson Dougherty, O190855.
Brig. Gen. Charles Lyn Fox, O154765.
Brig. Gen. Roy Albert Green, O226513.
Brig. Gen. John David Higgins, O152439.
Brig. Gen. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285.
Brig. Gen. John Williams Morgan, O140899.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Albert Palladino, O232912.
Brig. Gen. Russell Archibald Ramsey, A215598.
Brig. Gen. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, O399712.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf, O190484.

Brig. Gen. Albert Hummel Stackpole, O103158.

Brig. Gen. William Miles Stokes, Jr., O166391.

Brig. Gen. Carl Thomas Sutherland, O258676.

Brig. Gen. Lamar Tooze, O107927.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Marshall Warren, O266247.

Brig. Gen. Warren Claypool Wood, O295588.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Otwa Tilden Autry, O332367, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Ernest Oscar Black, O293790, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Aloysius Maximius Brumbaugh, O225777, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Louis Henry Charbonneau, O142965, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Harold Richard Duffie, O126221, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Robert Ernest Frankland, O277098, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Thomas Fuller, O248411, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Robert Morgan Jones, O270821, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. John Harry LaBrum, O909644, Signal Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Frank Lawrence Lazarus, O242867, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. James Bryant Mason, O219601, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Charles Sumner McCormick, Jr., O332054, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. John Adair McEwan, O280352, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. George Augustus Morris, O266651, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Henry George Nulton, O205635, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Charles William O'Bryant, O328896, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Almerin Cartwright O'Hara, O328935, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., O428375, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Maston Samuel Parham, O299244, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Don Archibold Parkhurst, O284478, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Manfred Ullman Prescott, O224176, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Philip George Rettig, O903151, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. William Thomas Rice, O320906, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. William Edwards Roberts, O233906, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Forrest Lee Roe, O226907, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. James Earl Rudder, O294916, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Clifford LeRoy Sayre, O201040, Chemical Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Carlton Kimball Smith, O231996, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Alden Earl Stilson, O320041, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Louis Frank William Stuebe, O170245, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. James Strom Thurmond, O191221, staff specialist, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Morgan Montrose Wallace, O275387, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Clyde Jefferson Watts, O269820, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of George N. Anderson and 688 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army, which were received by the Senate on January 21, 1955, were confirmed today, and may be found printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1955, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George N. Anderson, which is shown on page 595 and ending with the name of Andrew W. Zulli, Jr., which occurs on page 598.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 3 years.

Adm. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Adm. Ralph J. Arnold, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated:

Line

John H. Sides	Edwin T. Layton
Victor D. Long	Frederick R. Furth
Henry Crommelin	Robert L. Swart
Redfield Mason	Schuyler N. Pyne
Edward N. Parker	Robert E. Cronin
Edmund B. Taylor	Chester C. Smith
Frederick B. Warder	Harold O. Larson
George C. Wright	Thomas Burrowes
David M. Tyree	Donald C. Varian
Lewis S. Parks	Albert E. Jarrell
Willard K. Goodney	William G. Beecher, Jr.
Frederick N. Kivette	Charles H. Lyman, III
Ira E. Hobbs	Paul D. Stroop
Harry H. Henderson	Fitzhugh Lee
Joseph H. Wellings	Frank O'Beirne
Joseph M. Carson	Francis D. McCorkle
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.	Elton W. Grenfell
John Sylvester	Charles A. Buchanan
John M. Taylor	William G. Cooper
James S. Russell	Clifford H. Duerfeldt
Henry C. Bruton	George C. Weaver
Robert B. Pirie	Albert G. Mumma

Medical Corps

James R. Fulton
Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.

Supply Corps

Lloyd H. Thomas
Joel D. Parks
William L. Knickerbocker

Civil Engineer Corps

William Sihler

Dental Corps

Ralph W. Taylor

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1955.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, may we be very conscious of the clear and unmistakable leading of Thy spirit, as, in these perilous days, we are considering how best to defend our freedom and maintain the sanctity and safety of our Republic.

Grant that in the midst of all of life's bewildering problems we may be numbered among those who are working zealously and waiting patiently and hopefully for the dawning of a new and better day.

We pray that, when the dark moods of fear and anxiety haunt us and disturb our peace, we may encourage ourselves and our fellow men with the assurance that Thou art our God, sovereign and supreme, transcendent and triumphant.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 7, 1955, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2010. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For the consideration of the Congress, I herewith propose a plan of Federal cooperation with the States, designed to give our schoolchildren as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have.

Because of the magnitude of the job, but more fundamentally because of the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life, the means we take to provide our children with proper classrooms must be weighed most carefully. The phrase "free education" is a deliberate choice. For unless education continues to be free—free in its response to local community needs, free from any suggestion of political domination, and free from impediments to the pursuit of knowledge by teachers and students—it will cease to serve the purposes of freemen.

STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION

A distinguishing characteristic of our Nation—and a great strength—is the de-

velopment of our institutions within the concept of individual worth and dignity. Our schools are among the guardians of that principle. Consequently, and deliberately, their control and support throughout our history have been, and are, a State and local responsibility.

The American idea of universal public education was conceived as necessary in a society dedicated to the principles of individual freedom, equality, and self-government. A necessary corollary is that public schools must always reflect the character and aspiration of the people of the community.

Thus was established a fundamental element of the American public school system—local direction by boards of education responsible immediately to the parents of children and the other citizens of the community. Diffusion of authority among tens of thousands of school districts is a safeguard against centralized control and abuse of the educational system that must be maintained. We believe that to take away the responsibility of communities and States in educating our children is to undermine not only a basic element of our freedom but a basic right of our citizens.

The legislative proposals submitted to the last Congress were offered by the administration in the earnest conviction that education must always be close to the people; in the belief that a careful reassessment by the people themselves of the problems of education is necessary; and with a realization of the growing financial difficulties that school districts face. To encourage a nationwide examination of our schools, the 83d Congress authorized funds for conferences on education in the 48 States and the Territories and for a White House conference to be held in November this year.

THE CURRENT PROBLEM

These are the facts of the classroom shortage:

The latest information submitted by the States to the Office of Education indicates that there is a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, a legacy—in part—of the years of war and defense mobilization when construction had to be curtailed. In addition, to keep up with mounting enrollments, the Nation must build at least 50,000 new elementary and high school classrooms yearly. It must also replace the thousands of classrooms which become unsafe or otherwise unusable each year.

During the current school year, about 60,000 new classrooms are being built. Capital outlays for public school construction will reach an alltime high of $2 billion this year. During the last 5 years, new construction costing over $7 billion has provided new classrooms for 6,750,000 pupils in our public schools. During that time more than 5½ million additional children enrolled in school. Thus the rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment. But it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit.

As a consequence, millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only part-time or under conditions of serious overcrowding. To build satisfactory classrooms for all our children, the current rate of school building must be multiplied sharply and this increase must be sustained.

Fundamentally, the remedy lies with the States and their communities. But the present shortage requires immediate and effective action that will produce more rapid results. Unless the Federal Government steps forward to join with the States and communities, this emergency situation will continue.

Therefore—for the purpose of meeting the emergency only and pending the results of the nationwide conferences—I propose a broad effort to widen the accepted channels of financing school construction and to increase materially the flow of private lending through them—without interference with the responsibility of State and local school systems. Over the next 3 years, this proposed effort envisages a total of $7 billion put to work building badly needed new schools—in addition to construction expenditures outside these proposals.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Bond purchases by the Federal Government:

The first recommendation is directed at action—effective as rapidly as school districts can offer bonds to the public for sale.

I recommend that legislation be enacted authorizing the Federal Government, cooperating with the several States, to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at a reasonable interest rate. This proposal is sound educationally and economically. It will help build schools.

To carry out this proposal, I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $750 million for use over the next 3 years.

2. State school building agencies:

Many school districts cannot borrow to build schools because of restrictive debt limits. They need some other form of financing. Therefore, the second proposal is designed to facilitate immediate construction of schools without local borrowing by the school district.

To expand school construction, several States have already created special statewide school building agencies. These can borrow advantageously, since they represent the combined credit of many communities. After building schools, the agency rents them to school districts. The local community under its lease gets a new school without borrowing.

I now propose the wider adoption of this tested method of accelerating school construction. Under this proposal, the Federal Government would share with the States in establishing and maintaining for State school building agencies an initial reserve fund equal to 1 year's payment on principal and interest.

The State school-building agency—working in cooperation with the State educational officials—would issue its bonds through the customary investment channels, then build schools for lease to local school districts. Rentals would be sufficient to cover the payments on principal and interest of the bonds outstanding; a payment to a supplemental reserve fund; and a proportionate share of the administrative expenses of the State school-building agency. In time, the payments to the reserve fund would permit repayment of the initial Federal and State advances. When all its financial obligations to the agency are met, the local school district takes title to its building.

I recommend that the Congress authorize the necessary Federal participation to put this plan into effect so that State building agencies may be in a position to issue bonds in the next 3 years which will build $6 billion worth of new schools.

3. Grants for school districts with proved need and lack of local income:

My first message to the Congress on the state of the Union stated the view that "the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income." In my judgment, any sound program of grants must adhere to this principle. Some school districts meet the conditions. In them the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building.

I now propose a program of grants-in-aid directed clearly and specifically at the urgent situations in which the Federal Government can justifiably share direct construction costs without undermining State and local responsibility. Under this proposal the Federal Government would share with the States part of the cost of building schools in districts where one of the following conditions is met:

(a) The school district, if it has not reached its legal bonding limit, cannot sell its bonds to the Federal Government under proposal 1 because it cannot pay interest and principal charges on the total construction costs.

(b) The school district, if it has reached its legal bonding limit, is unable to pay the rent needed to obtain a school from a State agency on a lease-purchase basis, as described in proposal 2.

The State would certify the school district's inability to finance the total construction cost through borrowing or a rental arrangement. It would also certify that the new school is needed to relieve extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or hazardous or unhealthful conditions.

The Federal and State aid would be in an amount sufficient for a school district to qualify under either proposal 1 or proposal 2 for financing the remainder of the building costs. The requirement that Federal funds be matched with State-appropriated funds is an essential safeguard to preservation of the proper spheres of local, State, and Federal responsibility in the field of public education.

By authorizing this program of joint Federal-State aid to supplement the financing plans set forth in proposals 1 and 2, a workable way will be provided for every community in the Nation to construct classrooms for its children. I

recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $200 million for a 3-year program.

4. Grants for administrative costs of State programs:

In addition to immediate school construction, the Nation needs to plan sound long-term financing of the public schools free from obsolete restrictions. Our State conferences on education will help accomplish this. Out of these meetings of parents, teachers, and public-spirited citizens can come lasting solutions to such underlying problems as more efficient school districting and the modification of unduly restrictive local debt limits.

The Federal Government, having helped sponsor the State conferences on education, should now move to help the States in carrying out such recommendations as may be made. I propose, therefore, that the Federal Government furnish one-half of the administrative costs of State programs which are designed to overcome obstacles to local financing or to provide additional State aid to local school districts.

For this purpose I recommend a total authorization of $20 million with an appropriation of $5 million for the first year of a 3-year period.

This program is sound and equitable. It accelerates construction of classrooms within the traditional framework of local responsibility for our schools. It does not preclude other proposals for long-range solutions which undoubtedly will grow out of the State conferences and the White House Conference on Education.

CONCLUSION

The best possible education for all our young people is a fixed objective of the American Nation. The four-point program, herein outlined, would help provide proper physical housing for the achievement of this objective. But the finest buildings, of themselves, are no assurance that the pupils who use them are each day better fitted to shoulder the responsibilities, to meet the opportunities, to enjoy the rewards that one day will be their lot as American citizens.

Good teaching and good teachers made even the 1-room crossroads schools of the 19th century a rich source of the knowledge and enthusiasm and patriotism, joined with spiritual wisdom, that mark a vigorously dynamic people. Today, the professional quality of American teaching is better than ever. But too many teachers are underpaid and overworked, and, in consequence, too few young men and women join their ranks. Here is a shortage, less obvious but ultimately more dangerous, than the classroom shortage.

The conferences now under way and the massive school-building program here proposed will, I believe, arouse the American people to a community effort for schools and a community concern for education, unparalleled in our history. Taken together, they will serve to advance the teaching profession to the position it should enjoy.

Federal aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control of our schools could cripple education for freedom. In no form can it ever aproach the mighty effectiveness of an aroused people. But Federal leadership can stir America to national action.

Then the Nation's objective of the best possible education for all our young people will be achieved.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1955.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 85)

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 Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its chairman, covering its operations from October 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the period April 1-June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1955.*

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as the resolution indicates, this is an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate on the bill to extend the Selective Service Act for a period of 4 years.

We had a very interesting session and gained quite a bit of information before the Committee on Rules when the distinguished chairman and other members of that committee appeared before the Rules Committee seeking this place on the calendar. Briefly speaking, the bill would extend the Selective Service Act for 4 years and provide for some two amendments that were not in the old law regarding which I shall not go into much detail. Briefly they affect the National Guard and the status of veterans. I am particularly interested in the provision affecting the National Guard, because I think it gives that splendid organization recognition which it justly deserves. I am sure these two amendments will be discussed at length.

On the overall picture of the Selective Service Act itself and the necessity for the continuation of that law, I think there can be no disagreement.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. There can be disagreement over the extent of the time to which the law is extended, 4 years, can there not?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman or anybody else can disagree with my statement, and I even go so far as to anticipate that there will be disagreement on the time to which it is extended. I can understand that, but that was not what I had reference to; I had reference to the necessity for the extension of the draft law, and I am sure the question of the time limit will be debated. On the other hand, may I say to my friend in that connection that in the absence of some other provision or an adequate reserve of military strength I fear that we are going to be burdened with this for many years to come.

In the absence of some other provision for an adequate reserve strength, a military force, for this country, I cannot see that we can extend it for much less than 4 years. As a matter of fact, as just one of the garden variety Members of the House, not one who sets himself up as an expert but one who has given an awful lot of thought and study to this question and who has expressed his convictions on this many times from the well of this House, I cannot see, despite of what we understand happened or possibly I should say what we do not understand happened in Moscow on yesterday or maybe a month ago and we are just hearing about it now, that we are going to be relieved of this intense financial manpower burden in the foreseeable future. As long as that little band of willful men in the Kremlin are in power or those of like ilk, we are going to be faced with the necessity of maintaining a reasonable armed force in this country, and I use the word "reasonable" advisedly because I think the greatest mistake we could make would be to go into an all-out effort to build up the military strength of this country upon an all-out war basis and keep that

force indefinitely for the very simple reason, in my humble judgment, that these Russian masters want to require us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. Therefore we could not play better into their hands than by trying to do that very thing. That is my considered opinion; and I am very much pleased over the fact that more and more of those in authority in our military as well as in our civilian life are coming to this point of view.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased a few days ago when I noted that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, the able gentleman from Georgia, came out with a statement that he is going along with the President's recommendation, the recommendation of our Commander in Chief, upon a cutback in the standing Army. I think that is sound and I think our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services is on sound ground when he says he is going to back the President on that move. That is in line with the philosophy I have been advocating here for some time. Certainly if we cannot trust the President of the United States who is a military man in reference to these military matters, I do not know whom else we can trust.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I was very glad to hear this statement from the gentleman just now because of the fact that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, with those of us who have been in the recent days privileged to listen off and on the record from the Secretary of Defense and the various heads of our Military Establishment, having heard also on and off the record statements from our high military leaders, I adopt the same position the gentleman does in establishing the Armed Forces in the pattern to be set forth for the future.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to where the line of defense will be, or is? I mean, the extent of it.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, my friend, who is so much more learned in all matters generally than I am—and I say that in all seriousness——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman's sarcasm is all wasted. I want to know——

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, and I want to yield to him further if he wants to say anything, but let me just finish.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did I not ask a sensible question?

Mr. COLMER. May I finish?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did I not ask a sensible question?

Mr. COLMER. And then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman for a question. I said that I cannot set myself up as a military authority, but I do say to my friend from Michigan that I think this Congress was wise in backing up the President the other day in asking for the authority that he asked upon the Formosan issue. Does the gentleman want to ask me anything further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. My question was, growing out of my dumbness, as the gentleman has inferred——

Mr. COLMER. No; I did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just where are these men who are to be drafted going to be sent, or where are they to fight, in order to maintain what particular line of defense? Where? It was on the Rhine in one war, and now it is on Formosa, apparently. Now, what are these men to do? I mean, how far do they go? how long do they fight? and what is the objective?

Mr. COLMER. Now, if I may reply to my friend's question, I certainly had no idea——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is all right with me. I do not care anything about that part of it——

Mr. COLMER. That I was trying to infer that the gentleman was dumb. We all know to the contrary. So much for the personalities.

Now, to answer the gentleman's question, did the gentleman support the resolution that stated the other day that we would defend Formosa?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That we would?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not the question that I asked the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You answer my question first.

Mr. COLMER. I asked him, did he not support that resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I did not, and I did not vote against it. I did not vote. I want to know what our policy is, whether it is the policy of the Armed Forces or whether, as the committee over in the Senate unanimously reported, the next war is to be run by the politicians. That is what I want to know.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I learned long ago not to get into an argument with the gentleman, and I would not undertake to get into an argument now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want an argument.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman did not know how to vote on that question the other day, I do not see how I can answer his question now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I had my reason for not voting the other day, and I explained it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has explained the rule which is presently before us most ably, and I think effectively, and I do not know of anyone opposed to the rule. However, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report on the presentation to former President Hoover of the silver quill award and the address made in response thereto by Mr. Hoover. I further ask unanimous consent that should the printing require more than the usual amount permitted, that it be printed notwithstanding.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has apparently come up with the solution to that long-standing problem of Federal aid to education without Federal control of education. The administration's school-construction proposals are as imaginative as they are simple; they are as constructive as they are revolutionary.

Here for the first time, a President of the United States has presented a Federal plan which will function within the historic constitutional concept of State control of education.

For years we have been faced with critical problems in education, of which a shortage of school buildings is not one of the least.

There has been much talk in and out of Congress on a plan to meet the needs of the boys and girls in every State of this Nation. There have been some suggestions presented here. But they have been defeated because they were unsound.

The President has presented today a new approach to the problem of school construction in this country. It is well to note, first of all, that no violence is done to local and State responsibility.

The local school districts are going to construct and control their school building with a minimum of Federal interference. The States will determine the building standards and will retain authority in local and State bond issues. In the first proposal, only when school bonds are not purchased by private investors will the Government enter into the picture. There is no attempt here to deprive those who want a safe investment from buying school bonds.

Under the lease-purchase plan, the States will set up the agency to build the schools, while the local district rents the building. This is no giveaway program. The rent will include payment for the annual debt service, cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, insurance, and so forth. This is simply helping our people to help themselves.

We must recognize, however, that there are, in this expansive country of ours, boys and girls growing into the full obligations of American citizenship in communities too poor to provide adequate schools by bond issues or by rentals. In these children, too, we are

deeply interested. In these cases we propose to cooperate with the States in financing school facilities so that every child maturing in our Nation does secure that great national heritage of an equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the President's program is most encouraging in its fresh approach to a complicated and controversial matter. It is a historic departure from past refusals to assist in helping the youth of the Nation. We are proud of the moral leadership demonstrated by the President here today. We must build more classrooms. Here is a simple, sound constitutional plan which preserves local control but helps where help is needed.

Many new schools are being built without any Federal assistance. For that we are proud and thankful. But the President's proposal today is a step in the direction of granting to all children in all the Nation the blessings of an opportunity to learn.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was addressing the House, I asked a question. In substance, the question was that, inasmuch as he was supporting the bill before the House, he advise the House as to the necessity for drafting every physically and mentally fit young American into the armed services; that is, as to where, for what purpose, they would be used to engage in combat and when, after being so engaged, they might know that their task had been accomplished.

He came back with the statement that, inasmuch as I did not know how to vote on the resolution authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces to retain Formosa and adjacent territory after the Chinese Communists had announced that they intended to take it, he was not able to answer my question.

In my judgment, the two issues are not necessarily connected in any way. However, I have not the slightest hesitancy in giving my reasons for standing silent when the roll was called.

The so-called Formosa resolution was a declaration of war, contingent only upon the determination of the President as to when the actual fighting should begin.

Not only because the Constitution provides that only the Congress shall declare war, but because I believe that the people's representatives should decide that issue, I did not believe that I should shirk my responsibility to my constituents and leave it to a President, acting perhaps upon the recommendations of the State Department to decide when and where we should engage in world war IV.

If, last week, when that resolution was before the House, the Congress was not prepared to declare war, why should it shirk its responsibility, shove the issue over to the President?

Well might I have asked the gentleman and all others who supported the Formosa resolution whether they—yes, each of them—was personally willing to, on that occasion, have declared war. And, in addition, whether they would have declared war against China or against China and Russia?

For myself, before I vote to declare war, I want to know, if that is possible, whether the war in which we are about to engage is to be conducted by the military authorities or by the State Department.

It would also be helpful to know whether our drafted men are to fight under the Stars and Stripes or under the flag of the United Nations—whether they are to be ordered into battle by some officer of the U. N.—who it may well be cannot even speak our language.

We have the unanimous report of a committee from the Senate—4 Republicans and 3 Democrats—which unequivocally states that we did not win the war in Korea because the politicians dictated our policy.

Men died—many—perhaps thousands because that was permitted. I want no more of that.

If we are to fight the Communists; if that is necessary to promote the welfare of our people or make secure the future of our Nation, all right, I will vote for that, but I want no more of a war to fatten the purses of the moneychangers or the ambition of an Old World politician.

Permit me to add that, if we are to declare war, I would prefer that we fight our real enemy—Russia—and not the Chinese Communists.

Before the Congress declares war, in my judgment it should be advised, and fully advised, as to the reasons for the war and as to the objectives sought.

It should also be told in terms which it can understand and which the drafted men can understand, just what must be accomplished by our Armed Forces before the objective has been attained.

Before I vote for a declaration of war, I want to know where our men are to be sent and the goal they are to reach.

Before I vote to take 8 years out of a young man's life, draft him to fight under the flag of the United Nations for objectives which that organization may have in mind, I must know whether they are to fight for home and country or whether they are to fight for the establishment of the policies of some self-seeking international politicians.

Perhaps what has been said will give you some idea as to why I could not vote for that resolution.

Perhaps you want to know now why I did not vote against it. A vote in opposition to the request would undoubtedly have been interpreted by Communists and their supporters as a repudiation of the administration; that, in my judgment, we should not at any time or for any cause wage war against the Communists.

To that position—that policy—I do not subscribe. There may at any time arise a situation which will make it necessary to declare war against the Communists.

It is my hope that before that day comes—and I hope it will never come—our State Department or whoever speaks for the administration will, as I have before attempted to make clear, tell our people just what objective we seek, and just how far we are going under the direction of the United Nations.

I am all through supporting any and every move which internationally minded politicians may think will best serve their interests.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to get into an argument involving the discontinuance of the draft law at this time. I want to talk on some matters involved in the draft law as it is now proposed to be extended.

I have always tried to be a reasonable man. I have tried to be as practical as possible. I am perfectly aware of conditions in this world. I am aware of the fact that a great Nation such as ours cannot afford to take chances either with its liberty, its institutions, or its people. So the discontinuance issue is not here. I want to discuss something that is closer to the people, that is a practical, every-day matter with which the people come in contact.

My distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee [Mr. VINSON] is a great leader in this House. He can hold hearings in the most quiet manner and in the shortest space of time, but he is very effective. I intended presenting this matter before the Committee on Armed Services. Probably it was due to my carelessness, at least to some extent, but the hearings were opened and they closed before I knew they were opened. Being a chairman of a committee myself, it is difficult to find the time to either keep up with or do everything I would like. I could not get a copy of the hearings because they did not come off the press until yesterday. So that, in a way, accounts for my imposing myself upon the House at this time.

I think before we begin to talk about continuing this act for 4 years that we had probably better look back behind us and measure a few of the tracks made by Selective Service and the Defense Department—which according to a letter I received today is fast approaching the point of being one and the same.

Personally, the 4-year period I think is unnecessary; and to some extent it is an admission that we must be and must remain upon the brink of war the rest of our lives. God grant that will not become true.

I think the 2 years' stretching was done as another nibble on the program that this House has once before turned down, so when this bill comes into the Committee of the Whole for consideration I shall support an amendment to limit the renewal to 2 years. I think 2 years is long enough, and I have not found any justification for more. Once this House gives away authority, I have never seen it come back. I hope some day I will see a little dribble back. I am sure the American people concur in this hope, for after all when we give away power and so forth; that is, power rights and so forth of the American people.

What brings me here? We have just listened to a message from the President

of the United States in which he depicts a pretty bad picture relative to the field of education. We are all interested in education, every one of us. We know the contribution that education has made to America militarily, scientifically, socially, economically, and in every other way. Yet for the last few years we have been guilty of frustrating, stirring up, mixing up, and discouraging boys from attending college, and I think unnecessarily.

When this Nation is at war or in a national crisis and the chips are down, all bets should be called off, certainly, because we should defend America with everything we have, including our lives; and I am for that, make no mistake about it. But I fear that we have not sought very energetically to find a way to help the kid who wants an education for himself in order that he may be able to make a greater contribution to his country, and the welfare of not only his country but the world.

There is no need to talk about freeing the world unless we are going to free the boys and the men and the people of the world from the shackles of ignorance. You cannot do it. If you do free them, it will not be long before they will lose it again.

I have a suggestion I think will work. This morning I talked over long-distance phone with a dean of one of the finest institutions in America and one of the largest. I said, "What is uppermost in the minds of the young men who come in to discuss their problems with you?" He said, "Congressman, they want to know whether they should stay in or go on and get through the military, or just quit. They have gotten another notice that if so and so and so and so does not happen they leave, and that so often happens just before examinations."

He said, "It is bad, but the colleges of the country have refrained from emphasizing that because there is a great danger of the colleges being misunderstood, and some would think that they are not wholeheartedly behind the program of defense and do not want to make their contribution."

My suggestion now, and I think it is worthy of being explored by the committee, is that we should not take a boy year by year, and say he can be deferred next year if he is in the upper half. Some of the highest ranking generals in the Pentagon would have never been deferred because they were in the lower half of their class. But in the next year, they have to be in the upper half again. Oh, how feeble are we to pass upon and evaluate the contribution that a man can make at so tender an age as 18 or 19, and to say, "If you do not make such and such a grade, the War Department says, 'Out you go, you are not worthy of an education'." That is the answer.

I do not want the colleges, of course, to become a refuge for anyone to avoid any proper or patriotic service to the country. But listen to this. A boy could go into the service in June and serve 3 months, come out, and then go to college and come out in June, serve 3 months, and at the end of his 4-year college course, he would be a freshly trained man for 4 years. He will have been available for 4 years. If it is necessary for him to go another year, then all right. But now you say, "Well, can he be trained in that time?" Certainly, he can. The United States Marine Corps can make some of the best soldiers on the face of this earth in 8 weeks. If the United States Army cannot do it, then why not? That is their training period.

There is another point with reference to that. Let me read this to you, and this comes from the Department of the Army, the office of The Adjutant General, signed by William E. Bergin, who is a major general of the United States Army. This is the record of a boy who went in the service on March 6 and was killed in Korea on August 27 of the same year. Listen to this:

> He was trained from March 14 to June 20 when he left to go over.
>
> During that time—

Here is how the general gives the description of his training—

> His records indicate that he was qualified in the use of M1's, carbines, and light machine guns. While undergoing training with the 8th Infantry Division, he completed the following basic courses—infiltration, close combat, overhead artillery fire and combat maneuvers.

All of that was accomplished in 3 months and 10 days, and he was off and in another month he was killed.

Now I do not have just this one case where they were killed after 4 or 4½ months, even though every one of you remember the guaranty given this Congress by the Defense Department that no man would be sent into combat with less than 6 months' training, when they were calling for 17-year-old boys. So I say when the high brass tell me they cannot train a man and give him good training in 90 days, then they have to take back all they said about making 90-day-wonder officers—the kind that served over me—and the kind that have served over servicemen right on through the ages. You say, "Why just pick out that group?" No. You can take any group. The agricultural boy. He can take 3 months in the wintertime when agricultural activities are light and put his time in. You can take the manufacturing plants where the off-season time occurs, and they can select that time also. Why some of them take 2 or 3 months off anyway. Then, too, all of them may have the chance to go in and serve the full length of time if they want to do so. I do not think that it is absolutely necessary in order to make the draft work to do everything against somebody's wishes. We might at least fit it in a little bit and make it as convenient as possible.

Now we have had some other things to come up in this draft, and we might just as well thrash it out right here. There is no sensible, practical, fair or decent handling of hardship cases. I have had some cases called to my attention that made my blood run cold. I have talked to the colonel in charge of the State of North Carolina, and I sometimes think icewater flows through his veins. He apparently does not know what a hardship case is, nor is he interested in knowing what a hardship case is, and I have told him those very words to his face. And may I add this: I am certainly not the only member of the North Carolina delegation who has very little respect for his administration of the selective service law. But he is still head man and if you do not believe it, ask him or General Hershey, who will not only defend anything he does but attempts to justify it. The State selective service director is absolute dictator over the local boards and the local boards who render a patriotic service without pay have to take the blame.

His answer was, "Well, Congress has not given us any money for investigation. I did not know that case was that bad. I had no way of investigating it. We depended on somebody sending up the information." I must confess he was right. He should have more staff; he should have investigators. I say give him investigators, give him the necessary staff and help. Give him some clear language in the law, in the way of instructions. We are dealing with human beings, their rights, their happiness; and the happiness of their loved ones are precious to them. And there can be no justification for us to leave the law in such shape that would permit the same kind of inconsiderate injustice to continue.

Let me tell you something. This law is like any other law passed by the United States Congress. It will remain on the books only so long as the people of America think it is fair and that they are being treated fairly. For in the final analysis we may temporarily occupy this Hall, but this Government belongs to the people. When you mistreat some poor widow woman back in a community, who is unable to file the necessary papers to take care of herself before the selective service department, then you have irritated and lost the respect of the people around that community. All you have to do to start trouble is to get enough communities dissatisfied with that kind of situation.

There is another angle. You say, "Well, why are you taking up this time when the bill is here for passage?" I say that this bill needed a pretty thorough going over and some things being called to the attention of the House and the committee that General Hershey would not dare whisper about. There is not any such thing as some of the commands ever getting what they call compassionate reassignment. These matters are human things. That is, giving the kind of attention to human beings that engender respect. So, in my opinion, it is very necessary that we give serious consideration to the matters I have called to your attention in the order I have mentioned.

I do not know what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia is about to bring out later. I understand he has two or three bills. I do not know what they are, as far as that is concerned. We will hear about them when they come up.

I say that in the consideration of this bill it is not sufficient to brush lightly over this question of college students. Where are we going to get our scientists? Where are we going to get those that we depend upon so heavily? The last war was not won by brawn alone; and if we have another, it will not be won

by brawn alone. Brains and science must be among our weapons.

Now I want somebody to raise an objection. I will welcome anyone who wants to take issue with the statements that I have made. It is a practical proposal to say that upon the request of a student that he should serve 3 months every year for 4 years and be a freshly trained member of the Armed Forces, trained each year for a period of 4 years. If he is still needed for 6 months or 1 year, then O. K. Give the same privilege to others along with the privilege to volunteer for any length of time. Then not ask but tell the Pentagon to so arrange their schedule as to take care of and level off a regular flow of personnel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARDEN. All I want is someone to tell me what is wrong with that proposition?

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. How is it that you did not appear before the committee and present these matters at the time when the bill was under consideration by the committee?

Mr. BARDEN. Where was the gentleman when I started to speak? I told the gentleman that the meetings were opened and closed before I even found out they were holding hearings. The afternoon I found out they were holding hearings I understood they were closed and everybody limited to 10 minutes, I am not fussing with the committee.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman could have found out when the hearings were to be held.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not fussing with the chairman about that; I am just stating what happened.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a consent request to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support of H. R. 3005 which extends the period of the so-called draft law for 4 years. The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, must be considered solely in the light of the needs of our Nation.

There are few of us here today who view the necessity of pressing the youth of our country into compulsory military service with anything but the most deep-seated abhorrence and regret.

But it is equally true that there are few of us here who do not realize the gravity of the international situation which dictates the need for continuation of the compulsory draft system.

The precise question, Mr. Speaker, appears to be with respect to the period for which the draft should be extended. It is my belief that two very important and persuasive reasons support extension for a period of 4 years.

First, it has been estimated by our most informed military experts that our national defense requires a minimum of 2,850,000 men and women in our Armed Forces. There also has been reliable testimony that voluntary enlistments cannot be expected to provide more than 1,500,000 on a sustained basis to our Armed Forces. Thus, the absolute necessity of continuing the present draft law is clear.

Because the above manpower requirements are based upon efforts of both the executive and legislative branches to stabilize our Military Establishment over an indefinite period of time, extension of the draft for 4 years appears to have ample justification.

Mr. Speaker, continuation of the draft for 4 years allows long-range planning, not only for our Military Establishment, but for our youth as well. The 4-year extension as provided in H. R. 3005 in no manner changes the period of service set forth in our present draft law. The 24-month period of service remains the same. The program continues to be universal in that it applies equally to every American boy, and it continues to be selective in the manner in which draftees are called for duty.

The 4-year extension, Mr. Speaker, presents to our draft-age youth a realistic and honest appraisal of our national needs which they will be called upon to meet. To do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, would be less than candid on our part and would contribute substantially to the insecurity of this country's youth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I feel that passage of H. R. 3005 is essential if we, as a country, are to give unmistakable notice to the Communist world of our intention to defend the freedoms and liberties upon which the Nation is based.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3005, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am awfully sorry that the Armed Services Committee did not have the information that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina desired to appear before it. The first information I had about it was this morning when he stated he had a matter that he did not present due to the fact that the committee closed about the time he thought the committee opened.

In reply let me say it was generally known—carried throughout the country in the press—that the Armed Services Committee was going to conduct a hearing on the extension of the Selective Service Act.

It was our privilege in the past to have the benefit of the counsel and advice of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, and I am very sorry we were deprived of the opportunity of having it on this measure. The other Members knew we were having hearings. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] was there. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] was there. May I say, though, that had the gentleman appeared—and all the facts he has submitted this morning would have been the facts he would have submitted then—I would be compelled to say that I could not find myself then or now in accord with his proposition to only limit the draft to 2 years. I think a 4-year extension is proper.

Mr. Chairman, my fondest hope is that one day I may be able to stand in the well of the House and say to the membership that a firm and lasting peace in the world makes unnecessary the further maintenance of a large standing force. I would like to think that the immediate future holds the hope of a world no longer dominated by fear and oppression and the threat of extinction. Unfortunately, that wonderful day is not on the horizon.

The situation in the world today is one that calls for sacrifice, courage, and determination on the part of the American people. We are faced with the inevitable requirement of maintaining an Army, a Navy, an Air Force, and a Marine Corps, for the indefinite future, of not less than 2,850,000.

Recently the President, in a message to the Congress, stated that we could probably attain a force of 1½ million persons in our Armed Forces by volunteer means, but that was a maximum. Regrettably, that statement by itself means that we must make up the difference in manpower by a method of selective service. It is for that reason that the bill before the House today extends the Universal Military Training and Service Act until July 1, 1959.

To maintain an armed force of a strength of 2,850,000 through fiscal 1959, with 1 million of these men in the Army, will require approximately 670,000 24-month inductees, or an average of 14,000 inductees monthly. In addition, the Armed Forces will need approximately 2,100,000 voluntary enlistments during this same 4-year period. There can be little doubt, as testified by representatives of all the services, that the existence of the selective service law is the major factor in obtaining volunteer enlistments for all of the services.

Now this is not a new subject to the American people; nor is it a new subject to the membership of this House.

We have had considerable experience in the operations of the Selective Service System since 1917. In World War I 2,810,296 men were inducted; in World War II, from November of 1940 to March 31 of 1947, when the Selective Service Act of World War II expired, 10,022,367 men were inducted; and under the present law, the Selective Service Act of 1948, now known as the Universal Military Training and Service Act, we have inducted 1,966,526 men up to January 1, 1955.

So the Nation has lived with the present form of the Selective Service System almost continuously since September 16, 1940. You may recall that on November 18, 1940, the first selectees were sent to Army induction centers. And it was on August 12, 1941, that the House passed by a majority of only 1 vote, not quite 4 months before Pearl Harbor, an act extending the period of service for induction from 12 months to 18 months. On March 3, 1947, President Truman recommended to Congress that the Selective Service Act be permitted to expire on March 31, 1947, with the understanding that reenactment of the selective-service law would be requested if the Armed Forces would be unable to maintain required strengths through voluntary enlistments.

On March 17, 1948, 1 year later, President Truman requested the Congress to enact selective-service legislation stating that voluntary enlistments had failed to maintain the Armed Forces at a level consistent with national safety. And on June 24, the present law, then known as the Selective Service Act of 1948, was signed by the President. That was a 2-year law scheduled to expire on June 24, 1950. On June 23, the Selective Service Act was extended for a period of 15 days to July 9, 1950. In the meantime, the war in Korea began, and on June 30, 1950, the President signed into law the act which extended the present law until July 9, 1951. On June 19, 1951, Public Law 51 was enacted which extended the Selective Service Act for a period of 4 years to June 30, 1955.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given this chronology of the history of selective service to recall to the Members of the House the number of times the Congress has discussed this subject, pro and con.

We have a fairly equitable law now in effect. It is understood, and it is administered by local boards who know the conditions in their local areas. I think you would be interested to know that as of December 31, 1954, there were 3,951 local boards, 92 appeal boards, and 28 panels, throughout the United States and our Territories. And while there were 7,195 employees who received compensation, there were 39,793 patriotic citizens contributing their time to the Selective Service System without compensation from the Government. Insofar as the costs of administration are concerned, I think you would be interested to know that since June 24, 1948, up to January 1, 1955, the Selective Service System has cost $184,194,931; in other words, the Selective Service System has operated at a cost of approximately $100 per person inducted. This, of course, is not a true cost figure for each inductee since these costs also account for the expenses of registration, appeals, deferments, and more important, includes the costs of selective service processing of many thousands who prior to induction voluntarily enlisted in the branch of service of their choice.

Now I believe the Congress has been very wise in placing the responsibility for induction in the hands of local boards. After all, who knows whether or not a young man should be deferred better than those people who sit on these boards in the areas in which these young men live. Certainly no board in Washington, or no system operating from Washington, could ever have done as fine a job as these local boards have done.

The extension which is proposed in the bill now under consideration will continue in effect the system of induction that we all know so well. Every male citizen of the United States upon attaining the age of 18 must register with his local board; male aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States must likewise register. And male aliens other than those admitted for permanent residence who remain in the United States for a year or more, must register. These aliens may be inducted unless they make application to be relieved from such liability, but if they do so they forever bar themselves from citizenship.

Young men may be inducted into the Armed Forces upon attaining the age of 18½, and up to the age of 26, but no person under the age of 19 may be inducted if there are persons within the jurisdiction of his local board who are available for induction and who are 19 or over. For practical purposes, this means that nobody under the age of 19 is inducted, although the authority is there if it is necessary to use it. As a matter of fact, the present draft age is about 21.

The mental and physical standards now in effect are the lowest in the history of the Selective Service System; they are the minimum standards which were in effect in January of 1945.

There is ample protection in the law with regard to training. Every young man who enters our Armed Forces must be given full and adequate training for a period of not less than 4 months, and during this period he cannot be assigned to any place outside the continental United States or its possessions. No member of the armed services can be prevented from communicating with Members of Congress, and there is adequate protection with regard to living conditions and moral standards.

Individuals have and will be drafted for a period of 24 months. Individuals can volunteer for induction or can enlist in the Regular Army for 24 months.

Under the law, every person who enters the Armed Forces after June 19, 1951, is required to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces and in a Reserve component for a total period of 8 years. In other words, a man drafted for 2 years has a 6-year Reserve obligation when he completes the 2-year duty; if he stays in the service for 4 years, he has a 4-year obligation upon the completion of his active duty.

We make no change in the Reserve obligation, although our committee is of course studying intensively the new National Reserve plan submitted to the Congress by the President.

Now there are certain persons who are exempt from induction by statute—these are active-duty members of the Armed Forces, cadets and midshipmen at the Service Academies, students enrolled in a military college, if the college has been approved by the Secretary of Defense, ministers and students of ministry, veterans, and sole-surviving sons. Members of organized units of the National Guard, and all other organized units of the Armed Forces, who were members of such units on February 1, 1951, and have continued to serve satisfactorily in such units, are likewise exempt from induction. On the other hand, young men who join the National Guard prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months, are deferred from induction so long as they participate in their National Guard unit. Likewise, young men who are in the senior division of the ROTC, or other officer-training programs, are deferred from induction.

The question often arises as to who is a veteran and thus not liable for induction. Well, any individual who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, is not liable for induction. Likewise, any person who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, is not liable for induction. Certain training, such as the Army specialized training program or similar programs in the other services, and service at the Naval or Military Academy, or Coast Guard Academy, is not considered active duty. Likewise, all persons who are discharged from the Armed Forces after June 19, 1948, with 3 or more years of active duty to their credit are considered veterans. No veteran may be inducted, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, unless of course he is a special registrant under the doctors' draft law.

Now the big question as to who is deferred and who is not, comes in section 6 (h) of the present law. Let me say at the outset, that there is no such thing as a blanket deferment for anybody under this section. The law specifically grants the President the authority to provide for the deferment of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical fields is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

But this same section contains another provision that no person within any category that I have named may be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. In other words, the President cannot defer all people who are engaged in research, or industry, or in agriculture, or are studying medicine or dentistry, or optometry, and so forth.

And let me mention this, that any person who is deferred for any reason, remains liable for induction until the 35th anniversary of the date of his birth. We suggest one change in this part of the law which I will discuss later. You might also be interested to learn that this extension of liability beyond 26 accounted for 6.1 percent of the inductees in fiscal 1954. The law also specifically prevents the President from deferring anybody because of marriage except in cases of extreme hardship. The President has the authority to defer individuals with wives and children, or children alone, but since August 25, 1953, registrants not already deferred as fathers, could not use fatherhood as a basis for obtaining deferment from the draft, except in cases of extreme hardship.

Other provisions of law provide for automatic deferment for high-school students until graduation, or until attaining the age of 20. College students are entitled to an automatic deferment to complete an academic year. All further college deferments are based upon class standings, under regulation prescribed by the President.

Now let me talk just a moment about college deferments. I realize that it is very difficult for Mrs. Jones to see her son go off to the Army for 2 years because her son is not a college student, while Mrs. Smith across the street has her son home every weekend because he is a college student. One method by which this could be eliminated would be to abolish our college deferments. But if we do that, we would seriously jeopardize the future of this Nation. We must continue to produce doctors, dentists, scientists, engineers, chemists, and all of the other specialists that keep us ever progressing in this modern age of miracles. We cannot compete with the Soviet Union in manpower, so we must excell them in technological advances. To do this we must continue to educate a portion of our young men and give them the opportunity to obtain advanced education without a 2-year interruption for service in our Armed Forces. We defer only those students who stand high in their classes, for those will undoubtedly become the graduate students and the specialists of the future.

Now I do not want to give the impression that the Selective Service System is not granting industrial and agricultural deferments. I think you should know that as of December 31, 1954, there were 44,026 men deferred because they were engaged in agriculture. On the other hand, there were only 17,733 men deferred because they were engaged in industry. However, there were 165,812 men deferred as college students under Presidential regulations. I have already explained the reason for this situation. I should also add that this is less than 10 percent of the male students in college today.

So the proposed bill is simply an extension of the authority to induct men under the present selective-service law for 4 years. We have made two minor changes in the law to remove an inequity in one case and to eliminate confusion and possible future inequity in the other.

Under the present law, a young man who joins the National Guard prior to attaining the age of 18½ is deferred from induction so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily in his National Guard unit. Now note that under the present law he is deferred. This means that he is liable for induction up to the age of 35, which in effect means that he has a 16½-year reserve obligation. On the other hand, members of the Organized Reserve, including the National Guard, who were members on February 1, 1951, are exempt from induction so long as they participate satisfactorily in such organized units. If they leave an organized unit upon attaining the age of 26, they are not liable for induction; on the other hand, the young National Guard man who joined after February 1, 1951, would be liable up to age 35. Both have assumed a responsibility and a liability, but one has assumed a much greater liability. We have remedied that by reducing the liability from age 35 to age 26 for the young man who joins a National Guard unit prior to attaining the age of 18½.

The other change deals with veterans. Strangely enough, under existing law, no man discharged from the armed services after June 24, 1948, with less than 3 years of service, is a veteran. Now once a man has fulfilled his obligation of 24 months, he may not be reinducted. On the other hand, there are many individuals who have been or will be discharged with 3, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, or 22 months of service, who have not fulfilled the requirements of the law with respect to service and who, therefore, can and have been reinducted. As a matter of fact, the President, not long ago, in a directive required the local boards to reclassify all persons discharged from the services for any reason with less than 6 months' service. This was the prelude to their reinduction if the reasons which justified their release had changed. In other words, if a man is released for hardship reasons, and the hardship no longer exists, he can be reinducted if he had less than 6 months' service. This can be true of persons released with 16, 18, 22, or 23 months of service if the President should direct this reclassification.

In addition, we had a large group of young men in the Nation who had prior service which did not entitle them to a veterans' status with respect to the Selective Service Act. I am referring to young men who did not serve for a period of 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948. Some people had 10 or 11 months of service between those dates, but had up to 2 years of service after June 24, 1948. Still they were not veterans, and they were liable for induction and many of them were inducted. This was justified with the war in Korea, and with the heavy demand for manpower. Now the manpower situation has eased and we can adopt a more liberal attitude toward these young men and at the same time remove the confusion that must exist in the minds of these young men. For that reason, we have adopted an amendment which is simple in nature which provides that no regular registrant who served on active duty for a period of 6 months or more may be inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. It will not apply to those already in service, but these men are already receiving credit under a Department of Defense directive for prior service. They can credit their prior service so that they only have to serve a total of 24 months, so long as they serve a minimum of 12 months. But the amendment will clarify the status of all other regular registrants heretofore or hereafter discharged with 6 months or more of service.

Now this bill before the House today has one additional section dealing with the Dependents Assistance Act. This is the act under which the enlisted men in our Armed Forces receive allowances because of their dependents. By contributing varying amounts ranging from $40 in the lower enlisted grades, to $60 in the middle grades, and $80 in the higher grades, enlisted men may obtain from the Government, in the nature of a quarters allowance, sums ranging from $51.30 for 1 dependent; $77.10 for 2 dependents; and $96.90 for enlisted men with 3 dependents.

Obviously, if we are going to continue to draft men into our Armed Forces we must provide a system whereby they can obtain assistance from the Federal Government to take care of their dependents. We do not attempt and never have attempted to give amounts which would in all cases compensate for their loss of earning power while in the service. That would be manifestly impossible considering the various wage scales and skills possessed by these young men who enter our Armed Forces. But the Dependents Assistance Act does prevent hardship and does make it possible for men to serve in our Armed Forces knowing that their dependents are receiving sums ranging from $91 a month, to $176.90 a month, depending upon their grade and the number of dependents who look to them for care.

Now Mr. Chairman, what I have given you is the Selective Service System as it operates today with two minor changes we have made in the law and the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

I do not believe that a Member of this House will question the need for extending our draft law for 4 years. If anyone can see any method by which we can safely defend the Nation without a draft act or without going bankrupt, I must confess that it has not been brought to our attention. If we do not extend the draft law, what is our alternative?

We need only look at any daily newspaper to see the peril which lies ahead for any nation foolish enough to reduce its armed forces below that required for security.

Now let us analyze our Armed Forces as they exist today. I hope that we have finally reached a point in our maturity as a nation where we all recognize the necessity for stability and permanence in the size of our Armed Forces. That stability must of necessity range in the neighborhood of 2,850,000 men for the

indefinite future. I do not believe we are going to be kidded into another siege of valleys and peaks in the size of our Armed Forces; I hope we have learned our lesson; I hope the Nation is now fully conscious of the cost in men and money when we reduce our Armed Forces below a minimum safety figure and have to rapidly expand and mobilize our reserves at such a high cost in broken homes, hardships, bloodshed, and taxes.

The Congress has the constitutional responsibility to raise and maintain armed forces in defense of the Nation. In discharging that responsibility, we must base our decision on the obvious facts which confront us. Those facts are clear and we must not permit our Armed Forces to decrease below 2,850,000 men, beyond June 30, 1956, so long as the international situation remains as it is.

Every man in this body earnestly hopes for peace and will lend every effort to its attainment. On the other hand, we have learned through bitter experience that a Communist promise is nothing more than a trigger for another trap. So, if we are to represent our people in this great body, we must support, to the best of our ability, an adequate armed force.

We all remember where we stood just before Korea, and we saw the consequences of the relatively small armed force we had at that time. And I shall always feel that our pellmell demobilization after World War II did more to bring on Russian conquest than any other single factor. The Soviet Union respects only the might of weapons and the skill of the men who handle those weapons. Unless we have a stable armed force, equipped with modern weapons of war, together with the men who know how to use those weapons, we are asking for trouble—and lots of it.

Now what has that got to do with the extension of the draft act? Well, it is simply this: Regardless of whether draft calls are for 12,000, 30,000, 50,000, or 80,000 men a month, we must have a draft law to maintain an armed force ranging in size from 2,850,000 to 3 million men. If we can only maintain a volunteer force of 1,500,000, and I am confident that this is the maximum, then we must find a way to obtain the additional 1,500,000 men necessary to maintain our Armed Forces.

Now they do not all come through the draft system, but I think we all know that 1,500,000 come into the Armed Forces because of the draft process. Men join the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps because they do not want to be drafted. Some men prefer to consider themselves as volunteers, others envision a life of sailing the high seas. Others, knowing that they must serve in some branch of the Armed Forces, prefer 4 years in the wild blue yonder rather than 2 years of life as a doughboy. Be that as it may, whatever the motivation, do not let anyone fool you that the size of the draft calls reflect a decreasing need for a draft law. I will make this statement, and I am afraid that I will have to make this same statement 4 years from now: So long as we must maintain an armed force in excess of 1,500,000 men, we are going to have to have a draft law. And so long as I am a Member of this body, I will insist, with all my strength, that we not allow our Armed Forces, come what may, to go below a figure of 2,850,000 men. I will not be a party to a reduction in the size of the Armed Forces that is not warranted by the conditions which prevail in the world today and undoubtedly will prevail for many years to come. I will not jeopardize the security of this Nation through any methods of false economy which provide a dollar savings today at $100 cost tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, since we are all so familiar with the operation of the Selective Service System and know that it is as equitable a law as is possible under the circumstances, I hope that the House will overwhelmingly, yes, without a dissenting vote, support this 4-year extension which is not only necessary, but is absolutely essential for the preservation not only of our Nation, but of the free world as we know it today.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the exemptions today in this bill are the same as they were and that therefore, inasmuch as there are no agricultural exemptions listed here, there have been no such exemptions in prior bills?

Mr. VINSON. There has never been an agricultural exemption in this law.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman please put in the RECORD where these agricultural deferments were granted? To my knowledge, none has ever been granted in my part of North Carolina. It would be most interesting to find out where those 44,000 favored young men resided.

Mr. VINSON. I will be glad to break those figures down by States and show how many agricultural deferments there are in each State. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I shall include those statistics.

Farm workers engaged in production of necessary foodstuffs (as of Dec. 31, 1954)

	Class I-D	Class II-A	Class II-A (app.)	Class II-C	Class II-S	Class III-A	Class IV-A	Class IV-B	Class IV-C	Class IV-D	Class IV-F	Class V-A
United States and Territories	298,688	17,733	6,669	44,026	165,812	1,128,775	254,271	23	8,999	61,444	1,992,376	5,993,694
United States, continental	293,124	17,598	6,663	43,820	164,377	1,110,668	253,477	22	7,939	61,170	1,858,100	5,907,084
Alabama	4,946	117	20	141	1,389	30,771	3,512		6	762	64,311	108,278
Arizona	1,935	61	15	56	947	6,310	1,675		38	361	11,570	26,782
Arkansas	4,113	112	19	264	1,833	21,807	2,081	2	5	729	35,348	64,271
California	15,013	1,088	478	283	10,443	68,346	21,180		2,129	3,216	100,376	412,292
Colorado	2,322	107	17	97	1,737	10,628	2,667		39	487	13,912	50,532
Connecticut	3,463	655	204	616	4,856	8,469	7,150		55	734	18,971	83,359
Delaware	1,134	58	35	189	511	2,107	316		12	77	3,920	12,135
District of Columbia	1,212	55	33	4	923	3,204	1,170		79	173	8,827	33,124
Florida	5,629	101	13	33	2,504	17,518	3,066	1	119	853	36,755	89,551
Georgia	6,618	238	37	827	1,847	39,763	8,616	1	38	911	67,638	111,839
Idaho	1,652	46	8	53	631	6,027	858		36	579	5,243	23,002
Illinois	11,617	470	617	272	12,836	50,663	9,764		508	3,854	90,817	353,696
Indiana	8,615	219	115	78	3,708	36,356	5,088		113	1,876	34,417	161,885
Iowa	5,765	208	16	350	1,825	22,128	3,243		24	1,235	23,186	100,155
Kansas	5,481	125	10	1,957	1,839	16,795	3,017		42	1,001	15,035	73,481
Kentucky	2,881	144	29	176	1,670	31,805	2,501		14	915	49,557	110,956
Louisiana	9,033	137	18	11	2,499	22,666	3,637		35	879	53,344	99,924
Maine	1,527	203	31	204	755	8,041	1,121		86	271	10,184	35,839
Maryland	4,510	237	183	1,896	1,954	14,713	3,644	3	31	965	24,950	92,006
Massachusetts	13,521	969	139	680	8,556	19,443	7,730		167	2,192	39,706	193,311
Michigan	8,771	608	990	1,649	7,297	52,712	16,995		252	2,193	68,527	274,143
Minnesota	5,838	186	41	1,914	4,810	19,063	4,242		42	1,839	24,009	115,238
Mississippi	2,808	137	8	115	1,875	24,603	1,827	1	16	613	56,569	70,094
Missouri	8,072	178	13	120	2,621	29,590	4,696		42	1,999	41,514	149,035
Montana	1,861	111	10	922	455	3,830	3,887		16	198	4,842	22,614
Nebraska	3,447	127	15	197	601	11,024	2,507		25	730	11,778	53,347
Nevada	550	7	1	19	32	977	259		8	42	1,261	5,500
New Hampshire	1,786	77	32	195	908	3,299	675	1	30	222	4,529	20,993
New Jersey	14,062	1,000	191	1,246	10,127	20,077	8,735		292	1,782	44,667	196,455
New Mexico	1,842	38	4	40	262	6,220	1,135		11	260	11,013	25,607
New York City	12,746	1,999	69	25	6,444	27,615	12,928		1,164	3,724	111,889	327,131
New York (except New York City)	17,416	1,573	678	6,490	6,603	36,271	11,053		441	3,690	60,388	262,531
North Carolina	4,146	82	84	107	3,141	43,293	3,582		13	1,017	83,911	155,771
North Dakota	1,002	77	2	3,537	729	5,438	680		5	335	6,230	24,589
Ohio	11,990	866	667	1,523	16,132	55,798	16,612	2	166	3,128	76,621	331,308
Oklahoma	3,940	359	18	501	2,123	22,296	3,232	1	45	1,075	24,920	84,719
Oregon	4,648	150	22	157	1,352	11,376	1,915		43	770	14,648	58,203
Pennsylvania	14,154	1,582	742	5,087	16,435	65,167	18,888		182	4,146	103,300	460,389

Farm workers engaged in production of necessary foodstuffs (as of Dec. 31, 1954)—Continued

	Class I-D	Class II-A	Class II-A (app.)	Class II-C	Class II-S	Class III-A	Class IV-A	Class IV-B	Class IV-C	Class IV-D	Class IV-F	Class V-A
Rhode Island	2,135	88	31	81	837	3,156	1,054		19	383	7,215	33,354
South Carolina	7,605	158	7	393	1,438	23,490	7,492	1	13	570	48,974	76,867
South Dakota	1,429	65		829	356	5,683	3,282		23	373	5,450	22,724
Tennessee	6,780	384	59	1,470	2,923	35,325	4,043	1	23	1,051	55,806	117,204
Texas	18,595	1,212	134	777	7,508	69,536	9,952	7	1,236	3,054	137,134	298,415
Utah	3,264	73	2	119	292	7,256	4,269		32	1,338	5,854	28,780
Vermont	979	48	9	773	520	2,648	518		37	111	3,767	14,113
Virginia	4,014	313	211	897	2,691	25,101	4,710		21	776	52,125	126,087
Washington	6,514	141	66		3,172	16,417	2,859		82	990	18,688	85,782
West Virginia	2,626	85	32	72	1,699	19,395	10,861	1	4	473	27,726	84,221
Wisconsin	8,370	490	488	6,269	3,460	23,945	4,131		74	2,076	34,347	134,005
Wyoming	747	34		109	271	2,507	422		6	142	2,331	11,447
Alaska	250	5	2		19	403	307		7	12	1,753	3,998
Canal Zone	42				18	27	6		2		136	86
Guam	10	1			11	428	38		982	14	796	424
Hawaii	3,924	38	2	180	676	2,832	360		14	89	7,179	22,637
Puerto Rico	1,321	90	2	26	700	14,356	67	1	17	157	123,740	58,809
Virgin Islands	17	1			11	61	16		38	2	672	656

Source: SSS Form No. 116.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman also break that down as to whether those were directly engaged in agricultural production or whether they were engaged in the processing of agricultural products?

Mr. VINSON. For our information they are classified as agricultural deferments. I presume these were inductees who made applications to local boards on the basis that they were engaged in agriculture and the local boards granted the deferments. That is all I know about it. Those matters are handled entirely by the local boards.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think it should be pointed out that these are deferments rather than exemptions.

Mr. VINSON. I have already pointed that out.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think that is a point that everyone should understand clearly.

Mr. VINSON. There is no occupational exemption at all. Practically no one in this country is entitled to an exemption, under the statute, because of his occupation. But he may get a deferment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I apologize for laboring the point, but I do want to get this clear. Deferments in those cases are given usually on the basis of hardship, as well as other causes, rather than because of the fact that these men are engaged in the business of agriculture; is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know upon what grounds individual local draft boards grant deferments. But they are classified in the Office of the Director of the Selective Service as agricultural deferments.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Under the statute there are deferments because of national health, safety, and interests.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, bear in mind there is no change proposed by this extension except in two instances. There has been a considerable amount of confusion as to what constituted a veteran under the law. We have had instances where men have served as much as 22 months, and then the local boards have drafted them because they did not serve 24 months. There are hundreds and hundreds of cases where men were inducted who had 13, 14, or 15 months, who were discharged from the service, had gone home, and then the local draft boards picked those men up and inducted them for an additional 24 months. That was the situation that confronted the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Would the gentleman give us information as to the number of students who are deferred because of reasons for which students may be deferred, because of service in the ROTC, and so forth?

Mr. VINSON. I shall give that information, with pleasure, but I should like to finish with this part of the matter before I take that up.

As I saying, there were a great many men who were required to serve again because they had not served 24 months and were not classified as veterans. We sought to correct that, and we have proposed an amendment to the effect that if a man serves or has served a period of 6 months after September 16, 1940, he is to be classified as a veteran and therefore may not be reinducted. That is nothing but fair and right.

The Department does not look with favor on that amendment. They do not like it. But we think it is fair and proper, for after a man has served 13 months and is discharged by the Army and has gone home and gotten married and started life again, it is not fair for the local draft board to say, "We are going to induct you because under the law you are not classified as a veteran. You have not served 24 months." There are thousands in that situation today. So his total of service will be not only 24 months but probably 12 months or 15 months plus 24 months. We seek to clear that up.

That is one amendment. We had the privilege of having General Hershey and the Department comment on it. I say to you the Department does not look with favor on it. They probably did not want any amendments at all to this bill, but we thought that equity warranted the committee in doing that.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. As to the amendment the gentleman has just discussed, he means now that this will make it possible for those who have been reinducted after having served 10, 12 or 13 months to be released?

Mr. VINSON. No, they do not get out.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman's statement was that it would excuse from reinduction any person who had served since September 18, 1940, so his statement about September 18, 1940 is not correct?

Mr. VINSON. In broad principle it is correct, but there is some variation to it. It does not take out those that are already in.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for that amendment. The gentleman will recall that I had a bill before his committee for 2 or 3 or perhaps 4 years—I have forgotten—to do exactly that thing. I never could get a hearing on it, but I am glad that the committee has at last seen the light, and I again commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say the longer I serve with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, the more I begin to find myself more in accord with him. He is often pretty sound, and I hope he will be sound today in continuing this for a period of 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will accept as a reproof all that you said about him. But here is my question. Why was the Tydings amendment left out?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know what the gentleman refers to as the Tydings amendment. On what subject matter?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One time they came in with what was called the Tydings amendment, which provided that if a man was exclusively engaged in an agricultural pursuit, and could not be replaced, he should be deferred for a certain length of time. But later that was taken out.

Mr. VINSON. That has been out of the law for 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but why was it taken out? That is what I want to know.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot remember the reasons which actuated the committee 4 years ago, but I can only say this: There is nothing in the law which grants deferments by class. Nobody in any particular occupation is given an exemption.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but are not people given deferments because of industrial relationships?

Mr. VINSON. It defers them, but no man gets an exemption under the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking about deferments.

Mr. VINSON. He may get a deferment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They defer industrial workers? Why not defer agricultural workers?

Mr. VINSON. The deferment is granted on the ground of public health and safety and the other standards which have to be met.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VINSON. While the gentleman was at lunch, I stated that the information submitted to the committee was that there were 44,000 deferments given to agricultural workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is, such deferments were given previously or before?

Mr. VINSON. No; those deferments have been given as of the present time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But my understanding was that the reason they do not defer agricultural workers now is because there was a surplus of farm products.

Mr. VINSON. We are going to correct that today. An amendment is going to be offered here that those factors cannot be taken into consideration, that is, the factor of whether there is a surplus or a shortage. That is going to be corrected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may impose just once more, and I am seeking information, I want the gentleman to understand.

Mr. VINSON. I know that. The gentleman and I understand each other.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice with reference to industrial workers that individuals who had supervision over organizations which were contributing or which were representing labor were deferred. For example, a man like Frankenstein, and up in Detroit, and some more of those top people—in order to have industrial peace. Is that still in there?

Mr. VINSON. No; I would not say it was ever in the law to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It was in.

Mr. VINSON. That is entirely up to the local draft board.

In regard to the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, I invite the attention of the entire committee to this information. As of December 31, 1954, 96.2 percent of the total men registered, 18 years of age and above, had been classified. Of this number, 240,909 had been examined and found acceptable; 1,317,057 were classified as I–A, but not yet examined, including a few conscientious objectors who were available for nonmilitary service; 71,923 were deferred to complete high school; 3,934 were deferred in order to complete an academic year in college; 44,026 were deferred for agricultural reasons; 17,733 received occupational deferment other than agriculture; 165,812 received occupational deferments as students.

Now that is the information submitted to the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the gentleman would yield, my question was with reference to the 165,000. Does that include those engaged in ROTC training, or those who are not engaged in ROTC training but have student deferments?

Mr. VINSON. That figure involves only student deferments. ROTC deferments are classified as reserve deferments.

Mr. Chairman, in the next amendment with reference to the National Guard, we sought to clarify another situation. Under the law to date, if a boy joins the National Guard, and if he is under a draft age, he gets a class D deferment, and as long as he stays in the National Guard he is subject to deferment. The age limit for draftees is 26 years. Under the law for a National Guard man it is 35 years. He is subject to draft until he reaches his 35th birthday. We propose to change that, and say that if a boy joins the National Guard and serves honorably up to the age of 26, he is out and is no longer liable for induction.

Those are all the amendments, except the amendment by Mr. HARRISON. I sincerely trust you will reach the same conclusion the committee has reached, the same conclusion that the President has reached: That the military necessity, in the proper defense of this country, requires that we maintain an armed service of 2,850,000 men for an indefinite period of time. To support that requires a draft law of at least 4 years, in order to enable the Department to have orderly planning; to enable the Department to have an armed force that can meet local aggression, and to enable this country to have an armed force of such strength and might that it can block any major aggression until the country can be prepared.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand, you bring up the extension of the selective service law first. Did your committee consider the question of whether to bring out the Selective Service Act which you asked be extended for 4 years and at the same time consider the recommendation made by the Defense Department as to a universal military training program which I understand the Department favors?

Mr. VINSON. Let me say—and I yield myself another minute—that there is nothing in this bill about universal military training. This is no universal military training bill.

Mr. GROSS. Except the title.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to explain that. And there is no Reserve training program in this except the young man has an obligation to serve.

The title of this act is the Universal Military Training and Service Act. The law under which we are operating today means that every man upon attaining the age of 18½ years has an obligation to serve; in other words, the obligation to serve is universal; it applies to every boy in America alike, but the system upon which he is brought into service is selective. That is the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 33 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the very distinguished and able chairman [Mr. VINSON]—in fact, all the members of the House Committee on the Armed Services—for thoroughly and expeditiously considering this piece of legislation and bringing it by a unanimous vote—34 to 0—before the House at this time considerably in advance of its expiration on the 30th of June this year.

The draft act of 1940 expired in 1947; and, as usual following a great conflict, the American people the American Government demobilized too many too soon. We made that great mistake following World War I, and refused to learn through sad and painful experience and committed the same mistake following World War II by letting our Armed Forces sink to the level of a million and a half in all branches of the service. The year from 1947 to 1948 when the draft was not in operation taught us beyond question of doubt that voluntary enlistments would not supply a sufficient number of men in our armed services consistent with our national safety. So the Congress felt constrained to reenact the selective service law in 1948 for 2 years. It was further extended for 15 days and then quickly extended for another year. In 1951 we extended the draft act for 4 years which will automatically end on the 30th of June 1955. It could almost be called the Act of Extensions.

It perhaps is trite and superfluous even to remind you, not to inform you, that our American way of life—and when I say our American way of life, I mean the Christian religion, our democratic processes of government in a constitutional representative republic, and our fundamental economic philosophy of individual initiative and free private enterprise—those three things, the Christian religion, our American form of

government, and our fundamental economic philosophy, that have made America the greatest and most powerful Nation in all the world in less than two centuries under our constitutional form of government—is being challenged today as it has never been challenged before.

A great American, Will Rogers, once said that the United States of America never lost a war but it never won a treaty or conference. There is a lot of truth in that statement.

Whatever future historians might write about the 20th century, I think they will call it an age not only of marvelous scientific progress but an age of strife and turmoil, of violence and bloodshed, of disappointment and disillusionment, because in your generation and in mine we have fought two world wars and the Korean conflict, and really failed to achieve our goal or objective in any one of them.

Suffering 334,000 casualties, spending $34 billion, with a national debt of $26 billion we came out of World War I failing to make the world safe for democracy. Instead we witnessed democracy die, we saw the establishment of dictatorships and the rise of totalitarian regimes, fascism in Italy, nazism in Germany, and communism in Soviet Russia.

We fought World War II and we won that conflict, to be sure, at the astronomical cost of more than $400 billion, 1,065,000 casualties, and with a national debt of $265 billion. But we failed to grant and guarantee the territorial integrity or to respect the geographical boundaries of the little nations or to give the small peoples in the small countries of the world the right to determine for themselves in free, open, and untrammeled elections the right to determine the kind of government they wanted. We failed to reach our goal in World War II just as we failed to reach our objective in World War I.

Since the close of that conflict we have gone through another period of strife and of bloodshed in Korea that has cost the American people $15 billion and 145,000 casualties, perhaps the only war in our history we did not actually win, because the hands of our military leaders were tied by the politicians and diplomats, but we did not lose it. We did stop aggression at the 38th parallel and uneasy as that truce might be we are all grateful that the shooting has stopped. All lovers of liberty still hope and pray for a united and free Korea.

But on this February afternoon in 1955 we find ourselves neither in war nor in peace, but in a sort of twilight zone. It is neither black nor white. It is a dull gray, an era of uncertainty, what our President has so well described as an age of peril; not an hour, not a month, not a year, but an "age of peril." It is highly doubtful if there will ever be any peace in our time.

Disagreeable and repugnant as it may be, we must be practical and realistic; we must realize that for our own Nation's safety and for our own self-survival we must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air by building up and maintaining our military might in such a manner and to such a degree that our domestic economy can support and carry.

Often the American people when you mention national defense think only of armies, navies and air forces, of planes, ships, tanks and guns, but, Mr. Speaker, the military aspect is only one of the many facets of our national defense and of our national strength. We all know that great as is the burden, and onerous as is the taxation, we have got to spend more money than we ever dreamed of a few years ago in order to maintain a superior Air Force, the greatest and most powerful Navy on earth, perhaps not the largest Army but the most highly trained and best equipped with the most modern and up-to-date weapons.

Never should we attempt to match the manpower on the continent of Asia. Our only hope of victory or chance for survival in another global war is in our superiority of weapons and in the superior skills of our men who man those weapons. That is the reason and the justification for our spending such huge sums of money and effort on scientific research and technological development.

I am happy that due to the constant prodding and insistence of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the men in the Pentagon, not only our military leaders, but many of our civilian leaders in Government, have reached the point where they are not only going to avoid in the future these peaks and valleys, these periods of feast and famine of our armed services, but are going to level off on a stable program maintaining our armed strength at approximately 2,850,000 men at an annual expenditure of somewhere between $33 billion and $35 billion. As long as there are brigands abroad and aggressors in the world, we must build up and maintain our military might, and I think due to the wonderful teams we have, both in civilian clothes and in military uniform over in the Pentagon, we are getting more defense for our dollars today than we have in a long time.

But, military might cannot be achieved or maintained without economic strength. I am happy that the man in the White House, who spent most all his life in the military service, is wise enough to realize that the battle front can never be stronger than the home front; that in order to have military might we have got to have economic strength; that after all in World War II, without disparaging the heroism and the gallantry of our men and women, the 12 million who fought on land, sea, and in the air, it was after all America's industrial might and productive capacity that brought victory to the allied powers over the axis foes. On our farms, in our forests, in our mines and factories, we produced the food, the fiber, the weapons and the sinews of war that enabled us to triumph. Without economic strength you cannot have military strength, and there is where we should pause a moment to be calm and cool, cautious and careful not to overextend ourselves, because Lenin once wrote that the United States, like every capitalistic country, will "spend herself into bankruptcy." That is what the present occupants of the Kremlin, the 14 mad dogs, are hoping and praying that the United States, by siphoning off our wealth and depleting our natural resources in economic and military aid all over the world, will bleed ourselves white and become so weak and impotent that then, at the propitious moment, at the opportune time, the enemy can move in and take over. I repeat, along with military might we must have economic strength, and while there have been some reductions in the forces of our armed services in certain branches, a small reduction in the Navy and the Marine Corps and a bigger reduction in our Army, there has been an increase in our Air Force. I would rather trust than anyone else the Chiefs of Staff under the able chairmanship of Admiral Radford, the Secretary of Defense, and particularly our Commander in Chief and the National Security Council, who for long weeks and many months of earnest study—and as the President told us in January in his state of the Union message after much prayerful consideration—have arrived at what they believe to be a sane, sensible, and sound military program.

The so-called new look at our national defense is misleading. There is nothing new under the sun. There is constantly a new look every day at our military preparedness and our national defense. It must necessarily be so in this scientific age of rapid technological development, with the quick changes in the techniques and methods of warfare. The shift is one of emphasis, perhaps from one branch of the service to another, but all of our great leaders, military and civilian, know that we are going to have to have an Army, a Navy, a Marine Corps, and an Air Force at all times.

It is a matter of which particular branch needs the most at any particular given place and moment. I am glad that our distinguished and able chairman has gone along with the administration's recommendations, believing that the decision finally arrived at, after much prolonged study, thoughtful reflection, and prayerful consideration, is a safe and a sane program.

Mr. Chairman, not only must America have military might and economic strength, but we must have intellectual power and moral and spiritual strength. I am glad that my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] pointed out the necessity of improving our schools, and of having better and more advanced education; because no nation is ever stronger than the intelligence and the character of its own citizens. After all, if we are going to win the cold war in which we are engaged, it will be won not only by military might and by economic strength—security with solvency—but it is going to be won in the realm of the thoughts of men; because nothing in the world is great but man, and nothing in man is great but mind.

After all, we are engaged in an ideological war. Sometimes I think our psychological warfare has been the weakest link in our chain of defense and the lamentable and tragic thing is that the United States of America, in spite of all the billions of dollars in economic and military aid that we have extended to

other nations of the world following World War II, has been a rather poor salesman and has not gotten it across to the people of the various countries to which this aid has gone as to who is responsible for the succor and help given.

After all, an idea is the most powerful weapon on earth and it can become the most dangerous weapon on earth because you cannot shoot an idea with a rifle, stab it with a bayonet, or destroy it with an atomic bomb.

So in this cold war that is going to last for how long only divine providence knows, we are going to have to remain strong militarily, maintain our economic strength, increase our intellectual powers, and return to the moral concepts, the ethical ideals and spiritual principles instilled into us at the knee of our fathers and mothers. We have got to have a balanced national defense. We must not succumb to a blatant and arrogant jingoism and we must avoid a flabby and sentimental pacifism.

I repeat, there are many facets and angles to this knotty problem. No one is here voting for a draft because he likes it. It is really contrary to the spirit of freedom and to the lovers of liberty everywhere. But we are not the ones who are going to determine the size of our Armed Forces or the amount of money that we shall spend in building up and maintaining them. The size of our Armed Forces and the amount of money that we spend to defend this Nation will be determined largely by the actions of our enemy. And the men in the Kremlin are the ones who seem to be determined on worldwide domination and who, since the close of World War II, have extended Russia's physical and political domination from a population of less than 200 million to a population of more than 800 million, or one-third of the human race.

And they have evidenced no desire or intention of changing their fundamental aim and ambition of worldwide conquest and of domination of all peoples.

Realizing the precarious position in which we find ourselves, we are constrained in your House Committee on Armed Services, charged with the responsibility for the defense of this Nation, to bring to the House here in February, before the act expires on the 30th of June, this bill which will extend the draft, with two very proper and necessary amendments, in my opinion, which the committee has offered, for another 4 years, because certainly no man among us can foresee what is going to happen in the trying days ahead when the old ship of state is floundering and rocking amidst treacherous shoals, and in dangerous waters.

There is little I or anyone among us could add to the comprehensive and clear explanation given by the distinguished chairman of our committee. I am glad he pointed out that this is wholly divorced from the Reserve program or from universal military training or any modified form of it. This is something that, however distasteful it may be to us, we are compelled to pass in defense of the Nation and for our own survival as a free people. I do not like to take castor oil, but sometimes it is good for the patient.

A few days ago the Members of this body by an almost unanimous vote not only served notice on our enemies but gave assurance to our allies that the American people are united and determined that there shall not be further Communist aggression. I think that because of that firm stand, with all of the inherent dangers that go with it, we serve notice to the world that we mean business. All we can do now is work and hope and pray earnestly that a third world conflict will be avoided. If it comes it will not be of our choosing.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. You speak of assurance to our allies. If we have any allies they must be in the United Nations. What assurance have we from our allies that they propose to stand with us, any part of them? What are the terms of conscription among the member states of the United Nations? How long do they conscript in their countries?

Mr. SHORT. Practically all the countries of the NATO organization have conscription, but only Britain and Turkey, and I think perhaps Greece, have the 24 months we do in the United States. All the others are for a shorter period of time, from 14 to 18 months.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, there are 3 out of the other 59 member nations of the United Nations that carry on conscription as we do in this country?

Mr. SHORT. That is right. I will say to the gentleman that all of us have been more or less disappointed at the failure to achieve a greater cooperation and greater success in the United Nations. I know that I have been disappointed; at times disgusted. But being an infant organization, it has to crawl before it can walk and it has to walk before it can run. Though I believe we should have allies and assist them in every way, I agree wholeheartedly with the feeling of the gentleman from Iowa, whom I know so well and whose feelings and philosophy I know and respect, that we cannot go on forever siphoning off our wealth in economic and even military aid to take care of every nation from Zamboanga to Zanzibar without weakening this Nation and going completely bankrupt.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask the gentleman if the committee heard any testimony or gave any consideration to amending the provision in the law which says, and I think it became effective in 1950 or 1951, a man when he becomes 26 years of age is nevertheless still liable if he enjoyed a deferment. That applies not only to deferments for occupational reasons and questions of support and matters of that sort, but applies to men, for example, who are found to be disqualified for military service perhaps on one, two, or three occasions and later, after they passed their 26th birthday——

Mr. SHORT. And those causes of deferment were removed?

Mr. JONAS. That is right. I know the case of a man who was called up for examination on three separate occasions when he was under 26 years of age, and when he was not married and did not have a family. He was perfectly willing to go on each of those occasions, but he was rejected by the Armed Services Induction Station. Then he married and started a family. He is now approaching 30 years of age and has been recalled for examination and found qualified, and finds that he must go into the service. It seems to me that that kind of situation was not contemplated by the framers of the law when they said that if the man enjoyed a deferment, his period of service would be extended to 35 years. I just wondered if the committee had heard any testimony or given any consideration to that?

Mr. SHORT. That poor fellow—who is one of very few in the overall picture is most unfortunate, I would say, under existing law. However, one of the amendments which the committee adopted and submits to you is to reduce the length of required reserve service of members of the National Guard and their liability for service from the age of 35 down to 26 to conform with the draft law of drafting men from 18½ to their 26th year. But the fellow who through no fault of his own was not inducted or selected before his 26th birthday, and then who got married and whose physical defect, perhaps, was removed or overcome, under existing law is liable until the age of 35.

Mr. JONAS. May I interrupt—he may not have overcome it—he was just examined by a different doctor.

Mr. SHORT. He makes a fool out of the doctors, and there are some among them.

Mr. JONAS. I just wondered whether the committee has given any consideration to the advisability of eliminating that sort of thing from the deferment category.

Mr. SHORT. I should say that that is one rare case out of a thousand.

Mr. JONAS. Oh no—I know of scores of cases.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman realizes the difficulty, if not the impossibility of writing a formula that will apply universally to all people which will give exact justice in all cases.

Mr. JONAS. I realize that.

Mr. SHORT. In fact, the first lesson I think I learned as a Member of Congress—and I was not here many months before I found out how difficult it was to vote for a law to help somebody without stepping on somebody else's toes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that the physical requirements or the physical standards were dropped, and that is the reason many of these people are now liable to induction and service—because those requirements were dropped?

Mr. SHORT. Both the physical and mental standards were lowered.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes; mental standards were lowered also.

Mr. SHORT. Both the physical and mental standards were lowered to the

irreducible minimum, and notwithstanding those lowered standards, I was shocked, as were members of our committee, when we were told by the Director of Selective Service and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower that one-third of the young men of this Nation were rejected from induction because of a mental or a physical incapacity.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know of scores of cases in my own State and district where men were declared essential to agriculture and given a 2C classification where they are now occupying the same status, and the situation is more essential now for them to remain on the farm due to sickness in the family or on account of the father dying and probably leaving the widow behind, and where they have invariably in the past year put these men in class 1A and inducted them into the service. The essentiality has not changed. Has the committee given any consideration to that?

Mr. SHORT. If it has changed at all, they are needed more today than previously.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. I have many of these cases and I have the greatest sympathy for them. I do not like it to be given out that men who are engaged in agriculture in sections of the country where we have a surplus of certain commodities should be immediately inducted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would appear to me that the Selective Service and the Army are trying to handle the agricultural problem, trying to do away with the surpluses. That is one reason why they are inducting these men into service.

Let me ask the gentleman another question. As I understood it, back in 1951 the Congress did not approve universal military training.

Mr. SHORT. That is correct, by a margin of 73.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is something in the preamble of the Selective Service Act which would indicate universal military training. Does the gentleman agree that universal military training could be put into operation because of the words contained in the preamble?

Mr. SHORT. I do not think so, under this particular legislation, although I want to say to the gentleman that I feel very much as he does, that the title that was given it is rather misleading to the American people. This is really an extension of the Draft Act, and the title rather diplomatically, smoothly, and surreptitiously slipped over when we passed the extension of the Draft Act 4 years ago.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is exactly what the Selective Service has done in many areas. They have put universal military training into operation. Men who have been deferred for essential occupations have been classed I-A, and have been inducted.

Mr. SHORT. Of course under the present law I think it is up to the local boards to make the decision whether or not a man is to be inducted and whether or not he is essential to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation, although we have received many complaints. I dare say every Member has received complaints that the military and some of the directors of the Selective Service System in various States have put pressure on the local boards to draft more men in particular categories.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was it ever the intention in the House of Representatives or the Congress that this last act, passed in 1951, would do away with essentiality in occupation, to determine whether or not a man should be inducted into the military service?

Mr. SHORT. I do not think it was the intention of Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then the Selective Service System is going contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mr. SHORT. In certain spots I am sure that is true, but it is a most difficult problem, and in spite of all the criticisms that have been leveled at Selective Service and these local boards, practically all members of the local boards are serving without pay or compensation. They have rather a thankless task. I have considerable sympathy for most of them. Of course, power is abused in places, in a program so vast and large that it is nationwide. But power is abused sometimes even in other branches of government.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Following up the thoughts suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the chairman of the committee has stated in his closing remarks that under this act the obligation to serve is universal, but the system of choosing who shall serve is selective. Did the committee give any consideration to the fact that the very mechanics of the selection is what causes hardship under this act, and that, therefore, by lowering the age it would require more equal distribution of the obligation in the age group, and would permit an individual, once he is beyond a certain age, to plan his life.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I think the committee heard all those questions the gentleman has raised.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I take it that the committee would oppose an amendment which was introduced to lower the age limit.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In that connection, when we were considering the advisability of dropping the age, or encouraging the local draft boards to take younger men than older men, it was definitely brought out that should we have done such a thing we would have relieved these older men.

Mr. SHORT. Men in their late twenties.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Twenty-three to twenty-six. Men in that class would have been relieved of their obligation and privilege of serving at all, which is contrary to the basic concept.

It was also pointed out very definitely that if these young men had been afraid of having their lives seriously dislocated they could very well have enlisted for 2 years or volunteered for induction.

Mr. SHORT. They had the choice. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. They had the choice. I do not see that we are doing any injustice to these particular people.

Mr. SHORT. They have the choice to enter the service freely at an earlier age, as the gentleman from Maryland so well pointed out.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to point out that there are those men who have been repeatedly deferred until they reach age 26.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's remarks leave out of consideration the young men who are deferred not to escape an obligation but to meet an obligation, perhaps an obligation to his home, to his job in which he may be making an equal contribution to the welfare of the country; and he is absolutely incapable of planning his life, the life of his family, his marriage plans, or the plans of his children or his wife until he has reached age 35.

Mr. SHORT. That uncertainty, of course, confronts every young man in the Nation.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is the major reason we are discussing it.

Mr. GAVIN. It is still a matter for the local draft boards, the members of which are appointed by the Governors of their respective States, men of character and integrity, representative citizens of the community, who reach a decision on these matters.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 35 minutes and has 25 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 33 minutes and has 27 remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentlemen from Texas [Mr. KILDAY.]

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my pleasure in endorsing what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], my very good friend, has had to say as to the necessity for the extension of this law for another 4 years. The gentleman from Missouri has had the opportunity, as have I, from the beginning of the compulsory training program of being thoroughly cognizant of the facts. He has just completed 2 years, 2 very efficient years, as chairman of our committee, during which time he was a most able, considerate, and fair chairman. I am glad to know that he

comes here today in wholehearted support of the extension of this law for a period of 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, it was not necessary for our committee to hear witnesses as to the necessity for the extension of the law; nor is it necessary for us to quote to the Members of this House the testimony of any witness as to the necessity for its extension; we all know the situation which exists in the world; we know the necessity for an extension of this law.

As to whether the extension should be for 4 years or a lesser time, as the gentleman from North Carolina has suggested, let me remind you that if this act is extended as provided in this bill we will have had, except for a very limited period of time, a selective service and training act, or a universal service and training act in force for a period of only months less than 19 years. With the exception of the 1 year period from 1947 to 1948, we have had legislation of this kind in effect for 15 years.

I do not believe we can learn anything from our experience in the past 15 years that could give us any confidence in hoping that the extension of this act for 2 additional years would relieve us of the necessity; and as to the concern of those who are unfortunately subject to these provisions, we have been through many occasions since 1940 when the law was about to expire.

We know that the uncertainty which then confronted the young man as to whether or not the law itself would be extended far exceeds the uncertainty as to whether or not he is going to be called. So long as the law is in effect then, of course, every man knows that there is an obligation imposed upon him by that law.

After all, what is the Selective Service System? It is a system by which we supply to the armed services the manpower needed. The passage of it does not require that inductions continue or that they continue at any particular rate. Whenever the executive department, the President, determines that no further increase in the armed services is necessary he may reduce or even completely suspend inductions under it. So that in passing it we place it in a position to be there if necessary, not to be used if unnecessary.

Let us go back 4 years so that we may understand exactly what we have here, particularly in view of the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina as to the period of time and as to periods of training. In 1951 we passed the Universal Military Service and Training Act. Prior to that time we had had the Selective Training and Service Act. Now it is the Universal Military Service and Training Act. The emphasis was placed in the opposite direction.

That law is a permanent one. That law has no expiration date. What we are extending here is the provision of that law as to the date upon which inductions shall cease. That provision was put in for the very purpose the gentleman from North Carolina has mentioned of giving the Congress the right to reexamine periodically as to whether or not men should continue to be inducted. We are now approaching the expiration date of the period during which they can be inducted and the question is whether or not we are going to continue to permit them to be inducted.

The other phase of the law in 1951 was the UMT portion. In the law that we are considering here today, the one we are extending the power to induct under, it provided for universal military training, but before that could go into effect there had to be submitted to the Congress by a commission which we created a plan for universal military training which had to be approved by the Congress. We brought in a plan submitted by the Training Commission and the House rejected it. So that that phase of the law never came into effect. That phase of the program is not concerned here.

The gentleman from North Carolina has spoken about taking men in for a period of 3 months and permitting them to return to school. I am firmly of the opinion that something of that character can be worked out. I believe that the provision we brought in here to implement the Universal Military Service and Training Act would have done so. My recollection is we provided for a period of 6 months' training, then he would go to the reserve organization. I do not believe the gentleman from North Carolina supported that. I believe he quite vigorously opposed it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I very definitely did and I found myself with the overwhelming majority of the House.

Mr. KILDAY. I shall never forget the gentleman's opposition. It was not only firm but loud. We had quite a good time here discussing that matter for several days.

I believe that a period of active duty training and then into the reserves is the proper thing for this country but we have never been able to get it done. We have had hearing after hearing and attempt after attempt, but it has never been done.

I was interested in the unfortunate case which the gentleman from North Carolina described here of the young man who went into the service in March and was killed in August. I do not care if every general in the Pentagon says he was adequately trained, I would have felt much better about the example had he survived rather than been killed after having entered the service in March and finding himself on the front lines in August and being killed in the service. But that is not the issue here. That phase is not involved here.

We attempted in 1952 to pass something along that line. As the gentleman from North Carolina stated, he was successful on that occasion in beating our ears down and that proposal was defeated. It was recommitted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman wants to enter into another debate on that bill, I welcome it, but I do not think the gentleman is fair——

Mr. KILDAY. I insist I am being fair——

Mr. BARDEN. In repeating the language of the act. The gentleman who just spoke, who was chairman of the committee, and whom the gentleman just bragged about as being about the greatest civilian leader, a great past chairman——

Mr. KILDAY. Do not take all of my time.

Mr. BARDEN. You remember that he opposed that, too, did he not?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, sir; he opposed it. He has consistently opposed it.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think the gentleman would except either the gentleman from Missouri or myself in opposing some of the things—and probably by now does not blame us. I certainly have no regrets.

Mr. KILDAY. I yield no further, because I only have 10 minutes. The point I am making is that the gentleman from Missouri is totally consistent. The gentleman from Missouri is also differentiating between two different proposals. The gentleman from Missouri has always and invariably and vigorously opposed universal military training, and I am not too sanguine that he will ever support it. That has always been the position of the gentleman from Missouri. But the gentleman from Missouri has always supported selective induction when it was needed to raise men for the services, but the gentleman from Missouri has not raised here any question as to a limited period of training. He has endorsed its extension because it is just to secure men for service, not for training.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman mean to say to this House, because I make a suggestion to improve this bill, that I am not supporting selective service and the proper defense of this country?

Mr. KILDAY. I made no such statement. It may be that unfortunately the gentleman from Texas is given to expressing himself a little bit positively, but I know a gentleman from North Carolina who has the same failing. The thing I like about him is that we can have these fights and stay the best of friends. He gives no quarter and asks for none.

What I want to point out here is that this has nothing to do with the limited period of training and then going into the Reserve. This is the extension of the induction for a period not to exceed 24 months where these men are liable for training and for service, and having completed their 24 months they have a Reserve obligation, as all men have had since the original act of 1940, and that the two should not be confused. So, I hope that we will not have an amendment adopted that would reduce the period of extension from 4 to 2 years, because the events have not shown that we can be so sanguine as to expect that the situation in which we now find ourselves will have cleared within a matter of 2 years.

There are probably in the existing law many situations that could be cured. I believe it is true, however, that most of those things found to be irritating result from administration rather than the provisions of the law itself. I do not know how you could provide against arbitrary administration any better than the Selective Service Act has provided against it, because the final say as to who shall go and who shall not go is vested not in any bureaucrat but in the local citizens who serve without compensation. They are appointed in Washington, it is true, but the law provides that they shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Governor of the State. So we have decentralized this as much as possibly can be done. There may be provisions in the law which should be removed. I do not know that this is the time to do it. I think that this is the time to see to it as nearly as we possibly can that the administration of the law be in accordance with the written word and the spirit of the law.

So I sincerely trust that we will extend the existing law for a period of 4 years; and that in our consideration of it we do not become confused as to those things which we proposed here in 1952 and did not accomplish; but that we are proposing to extend the period, in a time when we do not know what is going on in Russia, when we wish to we knew more about what is going on in Formosa, we are extending authorization for induction for training and service for 4 years, and that we do not become confused about shortening our period of training under universal military training, which is not before us today.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act is evident. The purpose of this bill is to extend the authority to induct individuals into the armed services through the operation of the Selective Service System from the present expiration date of June 30, 1955, to July 1, 1959.

The United States must maintain an armed force of at least 2,850,000 men for the indefinite future. Previous experience has proved that the maximum that can be maintained on a voluntary basis is 1,500,000.

To maintain an armed-force strength of 2,850,000 through fiscal year 1959, with 1 million of these men in the Army, will require approximately 670,000 24-month inductees, or an average of 14,000 inductees monthly. In addition, the Armed Forces will need approximately 2,100,000 voluntary enlistments during this same 4-year period. There can be little doubt that the extension of the selective-service law is the major factor in obtaining voluntary enlistments for all of the services.

I believe that statistics will prove that during the periods when the draft law was not in effect, or was not in operation, the Armed Forces were unable to obtain their authorized strength from voluntary enlistments. Therefore, it is obvious that the only practical method by which the Armed Forces can be maintained at the proposed strengths for the next 4 years is through the extension of the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, in these troubled times our Nation must maintain a strong military posture. This is no time to be weak, for those who would advance the cause of communism respect only strength.

Under the provisions of the bill which would extend present law, exemptions are held to a minimum and, of course, there are provisions for deferments of certain individuals. It should be pointed out that these are deferments only, and that, in most instances, after deferments have expired those individuals will be required to serve and complete their military obligation to our country.

Representatives of the Department of Defense and of the military services have assured our committee that an honest attempt is being made to reach a period of stability in our Armed Forces. We all know of the "peaks and valleys" concept whereby the Armed Forces were increased during periods of war or national emergency and then allowed to almost deteriorate, only to be expanded again when the danger to our national security seemed apparent.

I should also point out that the bill carries an extension of the Dependents Assistance Act, which otherwise would terminate on July 1, 1955. This is necessary to enable enlisted members of the uniformed services with dependents to continue in receipt of increased allowances for quarters, thereby assuring adequate financial assistance to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, inducted or enlisted, in the future, as well as those now on active duty.

Much as I dislike the necessity of having a large military force in peacetime, I am nevertheless convinced that it is necessary now. It is one important vehicle that will enhance our power to develop a stable peace. The President has declared that the development of world peace is his major objective. He thinks that the step which we should take to help him is to stabilize our Military Establishment at the size recommended in this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, until such time as volunteer enlistments are sufficient to fulfill our military requirements, it is necessary to continue this draft. It may perhaps be unfortunate that we must continue to call our young men into the service, but the reasons are compelling.

This action is necessary if we are to safeguard our heritage, accept the challenges of our generation and meet any future test that might threaten to imperil our security and peace. There is certainly no evidence that the future of our country will face a diminished challenge in the years ahead.

There can be no question in the minds of those who have considered this problem and analyzed the world situation, that as long as the threat of communism hangs over the world, we must have a strong military force that can discourage aggression or effectively combat it if the occasion demands.

It is generally estimated that our personnel level in the Armed Forces can be maintained at approximately 1,500,000 on a voluntary basis. Present planning indicates the requirement of approximately 2,850,000 as of June, 1956, and which is some 300,000 less men than are on active duty today. This goal for 1956 is about double the number of men on active duty prior to the Korean war.

As long as the size of our military forces exceeds the number of voluntary enlistees, it is the duty of the Congress to assure that this gap be filled. That is the purpose of this legislation and I urge its passage.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the ranking member of the committee, for allowing me this time to discuss some of my views on the pending bill.

Let me say that I certainly hope to live long enough to see the time that we do not have to have a Draft Act or a Selective Service Act or a Universal Military Training Act in this country. But I do recognize the realities enough to know that we must have a continuation of the present Selective Service System which, by title, is now being referred to as the Universal Military Training Act, although it is not and I do not consider it as such. But I do say that there is a need for a continuation of it. I should like very much to see it continued for a 2-year rather than a 4-year term, and I will explain to you as best I can some of the reasons why I think it should be a 2-year term.

My district is a heavy agricultural and dairy district. I have had probably as many national health, safety, and interest cases as any Member of the Congress—or at least my share of them. I have repeatedly been impressed with two phases of those cases. Men who were deferred during World War II because they were engaged in agricultural pursuits, deferred during the Korean emergency, and deferred until the last year or 18 months are now being drafted, at the age of 28 or 29 when obviously they were under the same conditions for deferment as existed during all that time. But now they are being told that unless they serve before they are 35 years of age, they are going to serve now. I do not think that was ever the intention of the Congress either under the Tydings Act or under the general provisions of the present act.

Many of these cases are cases where old people own the farm which is being

operated by their son. I had one case of a widowed mother with a son operating the farm and a 12-year-old boy. Neither she nor the young boy could operate the car. They took the older son, who had been deferred for some years, and put him in the service. I wonder just what kind of soldier that boy is going to make all the time he is in the service while worrying about the hardship conditions which face his mother and his young brother on that farm.

That happened in many more instances where there was an old couple on the farm, with the father perhaps being as old as 70 and beyond, and the son, who had had the sole management of the farm, after having been deferred for years was taken at 27, 28, or 29 years of age. The only answer I got from the State selective service was, "Well, he has not served. He had better serve as early as he can, even if he is that old, before he is 35."

The same applies to these hardship cases that we all get. The services have indicated time after time that they would discharge a man on a hardship bases, but under the rigamarole they go through now they have to refer the application for discharge back to the Selective Service. The Selective Service will not admit they could possibly make a mistake, or resist the inference that they made a mistake in the first place, so they disapprove, the matter goes back to the service concerned, and the man stays on; and the hardship on that individual and his dependents increases day by day.

I say that some of the things that are done in some of these hardship cases when they are examined are some of the most pitiful that you can imagine. They are the cruelest administrative acts I have ever seen.

Let me say briefly upon the matter of compassionate reassignments that I have sometimes found the military quite inconsiderate. I think there could well be a little shaking up of the military departments in connection with the request for a compassionate reassignment, for instance, of a boy who is overseas and who might be sent back to serve at least some place where he could give some aid and comfort and assistance to his family, who have lost a husband and father and who as a consequence face difficult problems.

One or two Members have spoken about the local boards' using their judgment. Generally speaking, I have the highest regard for our local Selective Service boards, but some of them are simply tools of the "hard-boiled Smiths" and the "I-A Browns" that the State Selective Service send out and who tell the local boards what to do, that they are not to make their own judgments but are to take the judgment of these experts from the State Selective Service. With that I heartily disagree. I want the local board to make its own judgment, but I am not willing for it to have imposed upon it the brow-beating judgment of someone in the State Selective Service setup who comes down there and in 5 minutes tries to determine what the board may have spent days and weeks in determining, as to whether a certain young man should be deferred.

There is one other observation I should like to pass on to you. I think the average youngster would like to enlist rather than be drafted. That applied to me and it applied to my three sons. But now you have a couple of the services that will not take them in for any shorter period of time than 4 years, and I am speaking of the Air Force and the Navy. To the average youngster who enlists, that last year is just like serving a year in the penitentiary. He does not mind the 3 years, but he loathes and hates the fourth year. I think it is tragic that the great Committee on Armed Services has not taken that apart at some of the committee hearings. I talked to a lot of youngsters who feel just exactly that way. There is no reason or justification except that it is the easy and lazy way for the services to add another year to the years that are taken off a boy's life.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman has gone a little far and has used pretty strong language when he says it is the easy and lazy way. Because of the very nature of the service, particularly the Navy and the Air Force, 4 years is a much better period of time in which to train skilled men, particularly in the field of electronics and radar and in the other kinds of the latest equipment. You can train a soldier in 2 years time, of course. The Army takes them for 2 years. But the Navy and Air Force need a longer period of time to properly train their men.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, the gentleman knows very well that many of them cannot get it in 4 years so far as some types of training are concerned, and they have to reenlist and reenlist. My point is they can do it just as well under a 3-year enlistment as they can under a 4-year enlistment.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman had listened to all the testimony that has been given to us by the experts, I do not believe that he would hold that opinion. We learn that it is much cheaper to train a man for 4 years instead of having this expensive system of rotation every 2 years.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the services treat these boys right, they will reenlist and they would not have to worry about that.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to make a simple, general statement in reference to the need of the renewal of this law under the draft statute. I was in Congress when our first draft law in time of peace went through and was put on the statute books. We made it of limited duration, and each time when the termination date came around, we have had to extend the draft law and place another termination date upon it. When the President first requested authority for a 4-year extension, I thought perhaps that was a little long to ask the Congress to extend the draft law. But, then, when I went back and reviewed the history of the Draft Act, I found often we have had to extend this act, and each time we went through hearings and then went through the ordeal of extending the draft law, I realized that 4 years was not too long a period of time to ask the Congress to extend this law to draft our young men into the armed services of the United States.

I have been asked, since I have been on the floor, what this has to do with reference to the strength of the Military Establishment. Does this weaken or does this strengthen our Military Establishment? Have we, from the Committee on Armed Services, performed our duty properly in the extension of this draft by failing to incorporate within the terms of this proposed law some reference to the strength of our Military Establishment at the present time? Personally, I think not. I think that we have a duty first to place this law upon the books and let the country know that the draft is going to be extended over a period of time. Then, I think we have the obligation, and a serious obligation, to go more fully into the question of the strength of our armed services at the present time. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, but that the world is in very serious danger at the present time. There is no question but that we face serious and grave troubles in the Far East. I think, under the provisions of article I of the Constitution, section 8, the Congress is obligated to follow through on the question of the strength of the military department to find out from day to day and week to week and month to month, if necessary, whether or not we are providing for the Nation that type of military establishment which will do the very best that can be done to defend this country and provide for the continuation of free institutions in the United States and other parts of the world that are in need of assistance at this time.

I wish to say at this time that I think this is a separate matter, to be handled separately from the extension of the draft. It is unthinkable, to my mind, that other problems should arise at this time to delay this particular piece of legislation in its passage through the Congress. We have too much at stake to quibble over side issues at the present time. This bill ought to be passed and it should be passed at once. I concurred with our distinguished chairman when he suggested that we take up the legislation this year and divide it so that the extension of the draft would not be delayed, but would be passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President at the earliest possible date, to give further assurance to those nations who stand with us in time of peril that we are providing a military establishment with the proper means of insuring its continued strength; and, furthermore, that we are telling the Soviets in no uncertain terms that we are providing for at least 4 more years that our Military Establishment will be built up to its necessary strength by the use of the Draft Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to extend the colloquy I engaged in with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] when he was making his original presentation.

The existing statute is section 6 (h) as amended. I refer to the amendment which became law on June 19, 1951. That section provided as follows:

> That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces, or for training in the National Security Training Corps, under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the 35th anniversary of the date of their birth.

My point is that if an individual is taken to an Armed Forces induction station and there rejected because he failed to meet physical standards, when he goes back to his local board he is automatically placed in a deferred classification by reason of that finding by the Armed Forces that he is unfit for military service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is confining his complaint to physical disabilities of the inductee, or does the gentleman want to broaden it to include education?

Mr. JONAS. No, sir. I would not object to including rejection for mental conditions, but I am thinking now in terms of rejection for physical conditions.

Mr. VINSON. Now suppose a man had gone before a board 3 or 4 or 5 times and had been rejected on account of physical disability, and he passes his 26th year of birth. We will say he is 30 years of age. Then, under the law, he is subject to the draft until he is 35.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Thereafter a new doctor passes upon him and says he is physically fit.

The gentleman's point is that having been rejected 3 or 4 times before he was 26 he should not be required to serve after that age.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. How many times is the gentleman going to give him a rejection on physical grounds? Five times?

Mr. JONAS. I would not impose any particular number. I would say that if an individual is deferred solely by reason of the fact that the Armed Forces induction station rejected him, it ought not to count as a deferment so as to extend his liability for service beyond 26, because such individual did not ask for deferment; he reported when he was told to report for induction, went to the induction center but was rejected by the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. Let us go over it again so we may understand it. The young man is drafted by the local board, reports to the induction center and the induction center finds that he is physically disqualified. He goes back to his domicile, stays there a while; the induction board drafts him again and sends him to the induction center where he is again turned down. The gentleman takes the position that that should continue only until he reaches 26 years age.

Mr. JONAS. And then it ought to end. That is exactly my position.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman holds that when he gets to age 26 if they have not accepted him, then he ought to be free.

Mr. JONAS. If they have not accepted him up until he is 26 years of age, his liability for service ought to be like that of anybody else.

Mr. VINSON. I am somewhat in sympathy with the gentleman's proposition, but it depends upon the skill with which such an amendment is drafted. While we are talking about his plan we understand it, but when it comes to reducing it to black and white, it has got to be so drafted that it cannot be subject to any other interpretation.

The theory of the 35-year-age limit was to keep these boys who get college deferments and other types of deferments from escaping liability for induction. That is the base of the whole thing. It wasn't intended, as I recall, to apply it to one who has been rejected by the induction center on account of physical disability.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield, after he passes his 26th birthday he is not much good anyway.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is correct; and I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that he has put his finger exactly on the point I have in mind: It was never intended; I think it was inadvertently left in the law.

Mr. VINSON. It all depends, as I have said, on the drafting of the amendment. These matters are technical, and you cannot write this kind of bill on the floor of the House. It takes considerable time and study to learn how it affects other factors so that we do not set a precedent. In our desire to achieve an objective we may leave a loophole through which people can go that we do not want to get through.

Mr. JONAS. Just for the information of the members of the committee listening, I want to read the text of the amendment I propose to offer if given an opportunity:

> At the end of the first sentence of section 6 (h) before the word "shall" in the second proviso, add this language: "except persons deferred at any time by reason of having been found to be physically unfit for service at an Armed Forces induction station."

That would apply only to men who are rejected on account of physical disqualification after having been delivered to an induction station.

Mr. VINSON. And he would continue to be eligible for induction up to age 26.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Would the gentleman accept a modification of his amendment of substantially these words: "Provided the standards had not been lowered"?

Mr. JONAS. No; I would not favor that change. I think selective service ought to be able to get these individuals back up to induction stations before they are 26 years of age if they have not been deferred for some other reason; and my amendment would not apply to them.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us today, of course, is one that is necessary. Most of us are of that opinion. But I have been somewhat disappointed in the operation of this act on many occasions, and other Members of the House have, too.

The operation of it has got a little bit away from what the House intended when the act was first adopted. This measure was set up primarily as a civilian agency. Today it is operating primarily through the military in the country. The military has its place in our life, but the civilian has his place, also. The operation of it has been complained of today by the status of certain of these individuals as has been indicated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and others. Most of the complaints can be alleviated by the directors and others who administer the law. Many of the inequities should be corrected.

Under the law we inducted this year 6.1 percent of all inductees over 26 years of age into our Army. Just think what that means. If you had all of that flock of kids and their wives together you would have something that this country I think would simply rise up and say: "We are not going to let such a thing as this exist any longer." But that is what is going on under this act. These boys are deferred for high school, for 4 years of college, then they wind up with 2 years in the service and are married with 1 or 2 children and over 26 because of deferment. That is a very expensive soldier. I think the Congress should correct that situation and we should correct it in this measure here today.

We might just as well be realistic about this. We hear about a plan, and our chairman today has stated that this is a long-range program, one that we should make up our minds about. But if you are going to adopt a long-range program in this country, we should adopt one with some commonsense in it. That simply does not exist today. This is a training program. Whatever you say it is nothing else, it is a training program. You will find a very few boys today who are not inducted under this measure but all are expected and do service. So what is it except a Universal Military and Training Act? You cannot get away from it. You have a few deferments but in the end to carry out the directives everybody has got to take the training up to 35 years of age. In peacetime here we say, by extending this act there are going to be no deferments, we should be realistic by lowering the induction age, with no deferments except hardship and physical.

In peacetime today we say that by extending this act there are going to be no deferments but we should be realistic. We turn around and defer all high-school students until they finish high

school. Then we defer the boys for 4 years of college work provided, they make certain grades. Many of these boys are 24 or 25 years of age when they finish college. They then have to go into the Army and spend 2 years.

Therefore, you almost deprive the country of a very large percentage of the science students, especially, those in the master degree and doctor degree categories. Many of the boys are coming out of the service at 26 and 27 years of age. They are not likely to take further work in college. If this continues for the next 25 years, it will affect seriously our supply of scientists in this country.

With the turn of events today in Russia and our commitments in almost all parts of the world, it seems to me that we should look at this manpower problem in a serious manner. I have always supported the Armed Forces but I want to support them in a realistic manner because certainly our country cannot afford to go backward and lose our technical know-how. It takes human beings for this job and not machines. A machine is only the product of technical know-how.

World conditions today make it necessary that we ever remain in a state of readiness. This measure provides a part of that and on this basis, I am supporting it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, conscientious, thinking, patriotic, but anxious and worried constituents ask and write inquiring whether we are to have a military or a labor government, rather than a government of, by, and for all the people.

A LABOR GOVERNMENT

Since 1935, when the Wagner Act, written in the main by a Communist, and enacted by Congress to give employees the opportunity to organize and better their working and living conditions, labor organizations have become politically powerful.

Some of their leaders, instead of confining their efforts to bettering the overall welfare of employees as did the father of organized labor, Samuel Gompers, have used the unions to advance their own political ambitions.

Through the collection of initiation fees, union dues, special assessments, and the sale of right-to-work permits, unions have accumulated millions, if not billions, of dollars. Millions of dollars of these funds have been used in political campaigns to elect to public office individuals who too often accept domination from union officials.[1]

The net result has been that legislation granting special benefits and special privileges to labor organizations and their members has been pushed through State and national lawmaking bodies.

Though rightly and logically taxes can be levied or collected only by governmental organizations, unions have seized and hold the power to levy and collect contributions from employees, the burden in turn being passed along to employers, and through them paid ultimately by consumers—taxpayers.

The merger of the AFL and the CIO will undoubtedly bring on an organizing drive which, using not only argument, but beating and rioting, will result in forcing millions of additional unwilling workers into the union, where they will be governed and taxed by the unions.

Unless forthwith drastic action is taken, through amendment of the Sherman Act and the LaGuardia Act, to confine the activities of unions to their legitimate sphere—that is, an increase in wages, the betterment of the working conditions of employees—we will shortly have here in the United States a political government by labor with resultant legislation enacted primarily to advance the interests of employees, regardless of the effect which it may have upon industry and those who do not belong to the union.

We will then more certainly and with greater rapidity follow along down the road recently pursued by England and which, it has been demonstrated, leads to a destination unacceptable to anyone.

A labor government is on its way.

Whether labor organizations first attain their goal, acquire political control, determine our national policy, before we have a government by and for the military, is a question the answer to which is not clear.

One thing is certain, and that is, that, though here in America organized labor may at the moment go along with the military, basically their ends are diametrically opposed. Under the military, as has been demonstrated by history, the workingman is but another form of ammunition to be used and expended, as are atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons.

Organized labor's program, and the effect thereof, will be referred to later.

Our people do not want, and the Congress has more than once rejected, universal military training. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] a member of the Armed Services Committee, just stated, we have conscription, and I quote:

> Except for a very limited period of time, a selective service and training act, or a universal service and training act [has been] in force for a period of only months less than 19 years. With the exception of the 1-year period from 1947 to 1948, we have had legislation of this kind in effect for 15 years.

Then he added:

> I do not believe we can learn anything from our experience in the past 15 years that could give us any confidence in hoping that the extension of this act for 2 additional years would relieve us of the necessity.

The gentleman was speaking in opposition to limiting the extension of the act from 4 to 2 years. Apparently, we are here to adopt—and retain control by the military as a permanent policy.

THE PENDING BILL

The bill before us today is a bill to extend the conscription act for a period of 4 years—until July 1, 1959. This bill is but a milestone on the road which leads us to complete universal military training—to a military government.

Among other things, the act as amended will provide for the conscription into the armed service for a period of 8 years, or 96 months, of every physically and mentally qualified young American who has reached the age of 18 years and 6 months, and who has not passed his 26th birthday.[2] For 2 years he will be in the active service. Following that, he will be required for 6 additional years to serve when and where the military may direct. The plan is that he shall, during those 6 years, be required to take active training with the reserves, and be subject to call to combat service if the military determines his service to be necessary.

One of the reasons which impelled our forefathers to leave their homes and friends in the Old World, cross the sea, and endure almost unbelievable hardships in a hostile land, finally declare their independence, create and adopt a constitutional form of government, was their desire to escape compulsory military service under their feudal lords or a king.

Another reason was their desire to be independent, to escape economic as well as military slavery. They created a nation free and independent. The people of that Nation have, as has the Nation itself, prospered.

Our Republic as a nation grew great and powerful. It became a land to which the oppressed throughout the world looked as the one place where they might make their home and be free. It is a nation to which we are told all so-called free nations, when in trouble, look for aid, economic and military. It is the Nation to which the free nations look for military defense when danger threatens.

In the harbor of New York, the Statue of Liberty, with its ever-flaming torch, beckons the oppressed of the world to a land where the lowliest is welcome to an opportunity to be free, prosperous, and happy.

Present trends indicate that beacon will soon be a false guide.

If we are, throughout the world, to create and maintain economic conditions which will secure to other people the material blessings which we here all enjoy, then indeed will we be required to bend our backs, flex our muscles, employ our creative ability, perhaps become economic slaves of the rest of the world.

If we are to assume the obligations of and continue through military might to guarantee the continued national existence as separate and distinct entities of every other nation in today's world, then assuredly our natural resources, our productive ability, are not sufficient, and we must conscript our manpower to fight, as did the mercenaries of old, but without pay except as we provide that compensation.

---

[1] See hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., November 23, 24, 25, and 27, 1953, Investigation of Welfare Funds and Racketeering, pp. 139–441.

A casual glance at two reports filed by the CIO-Political Action Committee, Washington, D. C., and the UAW-CIO, Washington, D. C., shows Michigan political contributions of something over $200,000 for the 1954 general election campaign.

[2] The proposed bill H. R. 3005.

Since 1942,[3] we have followed a course of action which has finally led us into a surrender of our national sovereignty to an organization[4] whose policies and actions are dictated by nations other than our own. That surrender has destroyed the individual's liberty, made it possible to force us to expend our manpower and our resources in wars throughout the world; wars which, for either the protection of our people or our Nation, were unnecessary.

For 15 years, the youth of America has been forced into universal military service, where they now serve under an international flag—not the Stars and Stripes—under the orders of a one-world organization—the United Nations—an organization controlled, not by the representatives chosen by our people, but by politicians of the Old World.

Under recent policies, our men have fought three wars, none of which brought us either a greater degree of independence, prosperity, individual or national security.

This bill—and hereafter it will be referred to as an act, for undoubtedly it will be adopted by both Houses and signed by the President—gives the youth of America into the control of the armed services for 8 years, which, in turn, in wartime, will be controlled and directed by United Nations to serve the interests of nations other than our own.

The armed services have, in recent years, when engaged in a fighting war, been subject to the control of the State Department. The State Department, in turn, to a remarkable degree, has been subservient to international politicians and foreign interests.[5]

For the first time in our history, we fought a war—the Korean war—in the field under the command of a State Department, rather than under the direction of our military experts.

Our Republic is founded upon the assumption that the Federal Government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

More recently, it seems that the Government is supreme and the people are but puppets of the Government, and, far worse, of a government which accepts and attempts to execute the orders of United Nations.

Our people, who reserved all power not granted to the Federal Government,[6] are now actually and in fact, through their Government's subservient attitude, being committed to the control of the United Nations.

If men or women are needed to maintain the welfare of our people, their independence and their freedom—if manpower or dollars are needed to make secure the future of our Nation—all that is required is that we adopt a national policy designed to attain those ends.

Our youth will fight for home, for fireside, and for the security of our Nation. There is no reason why they should fight for the political aggrandizement of any world politician or aggressor nation.

It is doubtful if there exists an intelligent informed individual who will contend that the power, the wealth, or the productive ability of America, unsurpassed as they are, can successfully put forth an effort great enough to fight and win a war wherever in the world some power-seeking individual, some quarrelsome nation, or United Nations may start a conflict.

It has been said that communism is an ideology—a way of thought. History teaches us that thought control cannot be imposed by persecution[7] or by, from a military standpoint, a successful war.

Advocating the disuse of the sword by using the sword is strange logic.

It is my understanding that General MacArthur recently told us, in substance and effect, that peace could not be established and maintained by war. That being true, the only way that we can overcome communism — establish and maintain our political and economic philosophy—is not by war but for us to declare and establish a line of defense which our resources will enable us to successfully defend; and then, if our policies be sound and workable, our thinking, our way, through teaching and example, will prevail throughout the world, for all nations will find it good.

I will not vote to take 8 years out of the life of every physically and mentally sound young American and make him subject to a policy which calls upon him to risk his life thousands of miles from home in a war declared by and at the dictation of a United Nations organization controlled by representatives of other countries, who, on every single occasion, speak and act for the advantage of their respective countries.

IF OUR CAUSE BE JUST, WE DO NOT NEED CONSCRIPTION

American youth are patriotic.

They are courageous.

They are self-sacrificing.

They love their country, and for home and country they will fight, and to the bitter end.

American youth are independent. They have as great a love for freedom, for independence, for self-government, as did those who, throughout 8 long years, against overwhelming odds, fought for and established their independence; conceived and gave birth to the United States of America.

That the youth of America, of yesterday and of today, are as patriotic, as courageous, as self-sacrificing, as determined, as any whose like qualities are praised in history, can, if anyone doubts, be learned from a knowledge of the record they established in World War I, in World War II, and in world war III in Korea.

If one would learn of individual or group heroism, he has but to read any of the histories put out by the armed services, which in detail and with illustrations record the deeds of the teenagers as well as of those who had passed the voting age.

If one needs inspiration, let him look at the statue, the paintings, the pictures, which show the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima. Let him read the story of that heroic event.

The record of the trained and the untrained men who, since 1914, have fought, and of those who have died, in support of our present foreign policy, is one of which we can all be proud, even though those heartbreaking sacrifices have done little, if anything, to promote the welfare of our people or make secure the existence of our Republic.

But American youth are intelligent. They want to know the reason for a national policy in support of which they are asked to sacrifice all that is near and dear to them and go forth to battle on the far side of the world.

No Horatio at the bridge; no Leonidas as the pass of Thermopylae; no Spartan, was ever more willing to fight and to die in defense of country than is the American youth of today.

Our youth know or they have learned that President Wilson was reelected primarily because he "kept us out of war." Forthwith, we became involved in war. They fought and they died because, so they were told, war was an evil thing. They were fighting a war to end all war, and since that war ended, their sons and grandsons have been fighting World War II and world war III in Korea, while they have been trying to carry the tax burdens imposed by those wars.

They know that American ships were engaged in World War II months before the Congress declared war. They were told that our frontier was on the Rhine, and that all that stood between us and being overwhelmed by the German armies was the British Fleet; that our armies must travel abroad in order to maintain our own independence. A falsely described situation.

Today, our frontier, we are advised, is in Formosa. The armed services advise that we have some 950 military installations outside of continental United States.

We are told that voluntary enlistments are not sufficient to meet the Army's demand for manpower.

In every other field, before the successful individual or business organization decides upon its need to carry on its program, it determines what it intends to do and the extent of the operation, its ability to carry out the program. There has been no such determination by those in control of our Government.

Yesterday, we had one line of defense and one purpose. Today, we have a different one. Tomorrow, we may have another. Since 1914, we have had no clear, fixed foreign policy.

The purpose of all wars is to protect the individual citizens and the nation as a nation. Today, the first issues before the people and the Congress should be: First, what is our policy; are we an aggressor Nation or do we seek only peace? Second, just what do we intend to do; when and where does a war to

[3] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1942, vol. 88, pt. 1, 77th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 744–747; January 30, 1942, supra, pp. 886–889.

[4] United Nations.

[5] See report of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary, U. S. Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on the Korean War and Related Matters, dated January 21, 1955.

[6] Amendment X to the United States Constitution: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

[7] Roman persecution of Christians.

protect us from communism or from any nation become necessary in order that the Republic may continue to exist?

The determination of those two questions comes first and we must naturally take into consideration our ability to accomplish our objective. Until those two issues have been made clear, it is not my purpose to vote to conscript our young men or to require them to accept what, in effect, amounts to universal military training.

Today we are told that Formosa is the front or the back door to our homeland. Formosa, 10,000 or 15,000 miles away from our base of supplies, depending upon whether we go east or travel west. Formosa, which just a few years ago we were told by our military and by our State Department was of no value to us as a military outpost. Formosa, which today it is said we must defend, no matter how great or even how impossible that task may be.

Sometimes the thought occurs that if Formosa, under the domination of China as directed by Russia, is the key to our national defense, and if we must, for the future, maintain Formosa as a military outpost, just, militarily speaking, a stone's throw from China's communistic mainland with its hundreds of thousands of potential fighting men, we must be prepared to sacrifice our men for no apparent gain in the impossible task of conquering and holding China subject.

If our real enemy is communism, then Russia is the enemy to which we should look. If we have the military might, the airpower and guided missiles, the bombers, and bombs which our experts say we have; if their destructive force is what they tell us it is, then, if Russia is the undercover aggressor, it is time to use those weapons on the source of our trouble. We waste our energy in fighting a puppet enemy. If, for our national existence, we must fight, let it be against the real enemy.

And let the battle be directed by those who are trained to win wars, not by international politicians, who accept unworkable, security-destroying theories, who turn an eye when they see fool's gold on the horizon.

In World War II Russia was our ally. Before the war was over, and after, through our efforts she became a world power. Through our negligence, Russia gained control of China. With her help, China sent her Communists into North Korea.

And once again we were in a third war. A war in which our Armed Forces were denied the opportunity of winning, a war fought not under our military commanders but under the direction of the international politicians, a war the first in which we ever became involved which we did not win.

The foregoing is only a small part of what the youth of America today knows.

Knowing as they do that we became involved in the last three wars, and especially the last two, because those who formulated and directed our foreign policy have been thinking of trade or dollars or world government, rather than of the independence, the welfare of our people, and the security of our Nation, it is not strange that the young men have not rushed to enlist in an armed service where their destiny is controlled by politicians instead of by military men; where the objective is not a new declaration of our independence as a nation, the making secure their freedom as individuals, nor safe the future of our country, but rather a surrender of many of the principles which guided the men of 1776.

They have no desire to establish a one-world government under which they and their fellow countrymen have been, are, and will be, for time without end, bound not only to work and contribute to the well being of many who are unwilling to earn the blessings which we enjoy, but where they and those who come after will be under the command of the representatives of other nations, which fail to carry their fair share of any burden which may be imposed by a one-world government.

The last three wars have gained nothing for our people except an ever-increasing tax burden and an ever greater dictation by United Nations telling us how we should live and die.

We have heard overmuch about free people, free nations. We have contributed in dollars, in munitions, and in human flesh and blood to other nations under the assertion that our sacrifices were being made to protect our national security, to contain communism. And the burden is still on our shoulders.

When we, with tax dollars, give Communists Federal jobs, it is ironic to tell our youth that they must be conscripted to fight Communists twelve or fifteen thousand miles from the homeland in order to protect our country.

It is silly, it is absurd, to tell the farmer boy, the clerk behind the counter, or the young professional man that he is being called to fight a war to make men free when, in his home community, he cannot even go to work as a laborer without paying tribute to a union, or, if he be a farmer, drive his dad's truck with a load of produce to the home market without being required to pay tribute to a union whose boss lives in luxury and spends union dues in an attempt to purchase elections.

This act will call upon every young American who is physically and mentally fit to give 2 years of his life in the military service. In addition, he is required to be at the call of the military services for an additional 6 years.

It is charged that the act is necessary, that is, that our men must be forced to be under the command of the military for 8 years in order that our national existence may be protected.

That argument is an assertion that the youth of today is so lacking in patriotism, courage and determination that he must be forced to fight to defend his homeland. In my judgment, that is a false assertion.

Permit a repetition. The youth of today are as ready to fight in a just cause, to make sacrifices as great as were those of 1776 to 1782 or at any other time in the history of mankind.

NOR WILL THE MILITARY ACCEPT LEGISLATION

A previous conscription act provided for the deferment or exemption of individuals belonging to certain groups. Because exceptionally large amounts of food were needed to implement our foreign policy, those who were exclusively engaged in agricultural production and whose services could not be replaced were exempt from military service. The Tydings amendment was the one which carried that exemption.

The Tydings amendment was openly and flagrantly disregarded and set at naught by General Hershey, Selective Service Director, and those who accepted his advice and acted upon it.

I cite that action for no other reason than that it shows the complete and utter disregard by some in the military services of the will of the people and their representatives' opinion as enacted into law.

If you doubt that assertion, read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of February 2 and February 5, 1945.

Given a situation where the youth of the land are convinced that their welfare and freedom is threatened, the Nation's security involved, they will volunteer.

One of the reasons they do not enlist today in sufficient numbers to satisfy the demands of the armed services and the State Department is because they think the demands are unreasonable, unnecessary, and excessive.

Another is that they are firmly convinced that the threatened war is not a war for the preservation of their country.

Russia conscripts her men for from 24 to 60 months.

This bill today calls for the conscription of every mentally and physically fit man in America for a period of 96 months—24 months in the active service; 72 months in the Reserves but at all times subject to the call of the armed services.

Shortly, there will be—at least so I am advised—a proposal by the armed services for the enactment of further supplemental legislation which will call for universal military training—conscription—for 10 years or 120 months.

I cannot vote for this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I think that our committee has just completed one of the most important actions that it will be called upon to perform during this or any other Congress.

The phrase that we live in an age of peril and not in a moment of peril has been somewhat overworked, but in the process it has not become any less true. I cannot conceive of any Member of this House raising a serious objection to this bill, because it is obvious that every one one of us has exactly the same thought in mind—the maintenance of a free world.

There may be some among you, on either side of the aisle, who have certain reservations as to the precise manner in which we should go about providing for an adequate defense, but to me the need for an adequate number of young men is not an area which even admits of serious dispute.

We are not a warlike Nation. We fight only when we have to. We do not

like to maintain large military forces unless there is such an immediate and clear need as to make any other course suicidal. Today any other course is suicidal.

Nor can I believe that there can be any serious objection to the two well-considered amendments which the committee put in the bill. I refer to the amendment which provides that no person who has been, or may be, deferred under the provision of section 6 (c) (2) (A), of the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces, under the provisions of section 6 (h), after he has attained the 26th anniversary of the date of his birth; and to the other amendment which provides, in substance, that no person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 6 months in any of our uniformed services, or for a period of 24 months in the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction and service except after a declaration of war, or what is the same thing, in essence, a declaration of a national emergency by the Congress.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has expressed his concern over the 4-year extension of the Selective Service System. Many of us share his concern and I think quite properly so.

Many laws we extend for a single year, others for 2 years, but in this case, and in the kind of world in which we are living today, it would to my mind be unwise to extend the draft for less than 4 years. Running a military force is in every sense of the word a big business, and there is not a big business in the world which would think of projecting its planning for only a single year or 2 years. To have a strong, efficient, and well-planned force, we simply cannot extend the draft for less than a 4-year period.

Most fervently I say that I hope we are wrong in extending the draft for 4 years; I hope there will be no need for a draft 4 years from now, but I can only hope that this will be so. All information available to me—and, indeed, to every Member of this House—indicates that that is a small and puny hope.

International communism, our one great enemy, may fall from its rotten foundations within the next few years. We all hope it will, but at this time to lessen our military force on hope alone would be worse than unwise—it could be catastrophic.

Any act of Congress can be changed by a subsequent Congress, and should we find a year or 2 years from now that a draft is no longer necessary, then it simply takes another action similar to the one we are taking today to change the law.

Let us not vacillate and quibble at this time. A 4-year draft extension is notice to all others outside the free world that we really mean to preserve the peace and, if this is impossible, to fight with every power at our command.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (ch. 144, 65 Stat. 87), as amended, is further amended by striking out "July 1, 1955" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1959."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIER: In line 6, on page 1, strike out "1959" and insert in lieu thereof "1957."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, offering this amendment to the bill H. R. 3005 before us permits me to express my opposition to the 4-year extension and my sincere hope that this provision will not be adopted.

Let no one in this Committee have any illusions as to my not being aware of what I am undertaking here in face of the unanimous decision of the powerful Committee on Armed Services, a committee that is composed of such worthy Members of this House, with a world of eloquence. Their keen insight into such military affairs as it is possible to gain lends to us at least some leadership. However, I have sat here and listened carefully to such recommendations and presentations as would warrant my support of going along with the 4-year plan. Behind this amendment I feel quite safe in my prediction and fear of that ever-threatening compulsory universal military training. I think this is another step in that direction. It is for that purpose, and for no other purpose, that I offer this amendment.

I happened to serve in World War I. I was one of those who went to a camp where inductees were being trained. I have not found any argument here this afternoon which would warrant me subscribing to the theory that a 4-year length of service would serve any greater need or supply or any greater strength to the Military Establishment than the present 2-year law. I, too, like many other Members here today, have had 6 years of experience with this draft law. I think all of us can subscribe to the statement that one of our greatest problems and worst headaches, particularly during the Korean war, was with this draft legislation. I shall not attempt to repeat much that has been said here by Members who I think are far more capable of delivering this message than I am. I heartily support my proposed amendment and I subscribe and associate myself with the words of my chairman of the committee upon which I serve, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], in his opening remarks while speaking on the rule, and I also want to associate myself and my statement and my position with my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. So I leave with you this problem which I know rests in the minds of many of you concerning the wisdom, the correctness, the desirability of extending this law for 4 years when it has served quite fruitfully over 2 years.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota introduced the amendment which it was announced during the consideration of the rule, would be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. It makes no difference who introduces the amendment. The issue is clear cut: Whether there should be a 2-year extension or a 4-year extension. What is the history and the background in regard to previous extensions? In 1948, we passed the selective-service law for 2 years. At the expiration of the 2-year period, Congress extended it for 1 year. That was in 1950. At the expiration of that period, in 1951, the Congress after careful consideration and by a bill bearing this name, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, extended it for 4 years. Now that expires on June 30, 1955. So we come here today with the recommendation of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States and ask that this law be extended for a period of 4 years. Bear this in mind. It has no relation to service or the length of time that a man may serve nor has it any relation to deferments or exemptions. It is a question merely of how long a time this law will stand on the statute books before it ceases to be in existence or before it has to be renewed.

Now what was the basic reason for the 4-year period? My distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said:

> Why keep this hanging over the heads of the youth of the country for an indefinite period of time or for a long period of time?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Never did the gentleman hear me make that remark.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason why I thought you wanted the 2-year period.

Mr. BARDEN. You heard me use the term "a 2-year period." The reasoning was your own. I was talking about service in the college. I was referring to the fact that every few months during his college course the Selective Service was reminding and threatening him. I was not referring to life of the law, the truth about it, I am afraid, is that the Pentagon has little respect for any college except West Point.

Mr. VINSON. Very well. What I was trying to get across was what I thought the gentleman had said—the danger of a 4-year period is the uncertainty that hangs over the heads of the youth of the country. They cannot plan because they do not know when they are going to be called. So therefore you should have a lesser period of time. It should be 2 years so that he can make plans and preparations. Well, I think the 4-year period is far more conducive to orderly planning than a 2-year period. Then a young man knows that within a 4-year period he owes an obligation and will have to serve. Under a 2-year extension he will say, "What is the history of the draft? Every time it has been extended it has to be re-extended. So therefore, I cannot, with any degree of certainty, make any proper plans over a period of 2 years."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman made reference to an extension of 4 years in 1951. That is true, but we were at war in 1951. We are not in war at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Well, let us talk about that a little bit. Perhaps I had better not talk about it. This is a time when we should not rock the boat. We had better keep our mouths shut unless we know exactly what we want to say. But we are about as close to shooting as at any time that has ever happened.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] may have 10 minutes to address the Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Now, here is the sound military reason why we are asking for it, and it is a sound reason. What is the Department seeking to do today? For the first time in the 40 years that I have served in this House a stable military program has been submitted to the country. Every man who has testified before the committee has said the day of huge forces and the day of cutting down has passed away. We are trying to level off, so the world can know and the country can know. It is going to cost aproximately $36 billion a year to support the armed services for an indefinite period of time, and it is going to take around 2,850,000 men to maintain that kind of defense. So therefore, in their planning the military leaders said they must have orderly planning; planning that requires a law under which we will know we have a sufficient number of men coming in year by year at the rate of 14,000 a month as inductees. In addition, there must be on the lawbooks a law that will keep voluntary enlistments up. Do you think you could maintain a service of 2,850,000 men on a voluntary plan? Of course you could not. So you must have selective service. And you must have, combined with selective service, voluntary enlistments. Voluntary enlistments plus the draft will furnish a stabilized army and a stabilized force of some 2,850,000 men. In fiscal 1955 the authorized enlisted end strength of the Army will be 979,800 men. In fiscal 1956 it will be 911,600. We are trying to level off. We are trying to have an orderly program. We are trying to write a law that will let the country know that for 4 years every man 18 years of age is liable to be inducted.

I say this proposed amendment has nothing to do with the training; it has nothing to do with the service; it merely indicates that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota say, "Come back here 2 years from now and let us extend it again."

I say that creates the greatest uncertainty in the minds of the youth of the country, because they want to know how long this obligation is going to hang over them.

So I trust this committee will reject this proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota and let this draft law be extended for a period of 4 years just as it was extended in 1951. In 1951 there was trouble in Korea. In 1955 we are in trouble in the straits of Formosa.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my keen appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for the very courteous suggestion made to the chairman in the matter of extension of time.

The amendment introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota is the same amendment I had drawn and expected to introduce.

I do not see much argument in the facts presented by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, when he tells you what the Pentagon wants to plan. I do not see why every other department in the Government does not come in here and say they could plan much better if we would give them all the money they wanted for 4 years instead of 1. But the Pentagon should not be so disturbed; they have much more job security then we; our jobs last for but 2 years.

If this amendment is adopted this draft law is extended for approximately 2½ years from this date. It does not expire until July 1, 1955, and then it is extended for 2 years from that date.

I was very sincere in my suggestion to the House that I thought there were other things in this bill to which we should give consideration. One has been developed on the floor this afternoon and the chairman indicated that with the proper language he would take it, which was right much of a change.

If I were capable of writing the kind of amendment here on the floor I thought would accomplish the objective relative to the college students of the country and the other folks who want to serve but should be given more consideration as suggested in my talk I would do it, but I simply cannot do it on the floor of the House; that is one of those kinds of things you cannot do without technical assistance in such a complicated bill as this.

What did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] say? And he and I accept each other as authorities when the one says something that helps the other; and I take his word. "There are in the existing law many defects that could be cured."

If there are defects in the law that can be cured, and the Chairman says this is not the proper place to cure them or the proper time, then it strikes me that we should not put off that necessary job any longer than 2½ years from now. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has been one of the stanchest supporters of the Defense Department in the House of Representatives during all of the years he has been here, but he is apprehensive of the color that this situation is taking on in various States.

Who knows how many more directives there may be or, how repulsive they may be, how they may be a misfit in our economy and among our people in the next 2½ years? In my opinion, it would be a very sensible, very prudent, and a very wise thing, too. Let us looksee at this legislation 2½ years from now. This is the time the gentleman's amendment extends the law to.

We are not unmindful of the dangers of the world. Certainly we are not. There is no attempt on the part of anyone to avoid or to underestimate it. We are all conscious of our duty. We may be brought to be very much conscious of it if this law begins to be maladministered. I have seen some laws maladministered in the 20 years I have been in this House. There is not a gentleman here who has served very long but what has seen the same thing. We get more trouble from administrative orders and from the laws they write. We write a little law: They write a big law. I think every department of this Government should be made to account to the Congress of the United States—the representatives of the people—every 2 years, at least, and I certainly would make no exception for the Department of Defense.

I say again that an extension of this law for 2½ years is a safeguard against their just running away with the situation. If it works well, then the House will be of the temperament it is today and can extend it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DIES. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, will the act expire while Congress is in session?

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman can tell me when the Congress is going to adjourn in 1957 I can answer the question.

Mr. DIES. We pretty generally know that Congress on the average continues until the latter part of July or the first part of August. I will ask the gentleman this question: What is the date of expiration?

Mr. BARDEN. July 1, 1957. It expires this year on July 1, 1955, so it is extended 2 years from July 1.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman has referred to 2½ years.

Mr. BARDEN. It is approximately 2½ years from now. I was looking into the future as our eyes look forward. It is approximately 2½ years from now. But it extends the law for 2 years from July 1, 1955. I cannot see any objection to that.

I am not at all frightened about the fact that we may be in trouble. We have been in trouble during the 20 years I have been here, but I do not think you are going to either cure it or put off the trouble by extending a law for 4 years that even on the floor today is

one that admittedly contains many defects. Two and a half years from now it seems to me would be time for the House to take another look at the law we have written. Whether we are here or not a Congress will be here, a competent Congress sent by the people. I think the better part of wisdom requires that we legislate within reason.

The Pentagon can draw their plans, yes, but the responsibility of legislation rests here in this body. I will listen to their suggestions and to their advice, but I will not have them lead me around and tell me what is going to be good for me or for this House 2½ years from now. They have shown no inclination to be very modest. I am sure they would agree to a 10 year extension with their recommendation as to appropriations, but if that is good for the greatest spending department of the Government, why is it not good for the lesser departments. So I sincerely hope that the House will adopt the gentleman's amendment and extend the law from July 1, 1955 to July 1, 1957, which is, I repeat, approximately 2½ years from the present date.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to disagree with my friends from Minnesota and from North Carolina, I am constrained to oppose this amendment because, as has been pointed out by the chairman of our committee, I think the 4-year extension will give to the youth of the Nation advance notice of what the Government reasonably expects from them and will enable them to plan their futures better than a shorter period. I think that it will help not only the men inducted into the service but it will help our Defense Department immeasurably in planning for the future and will result in economic savings. I think it will also relieve the Members of Congress from some of the worries of having to take up this rather unpleasant problem every 2 years.

I tried to point out earlier this afternoon that the President has stated we are living in an age of peril. If we extend this act for 4 years, it will serve notice on our enemies or potential enemies that we have the long pull in mind; that we are not going to change our plans overnight, and at the same time it will give assurance to our allies that America means business; that we are going to build up and maintain a reasonable posture of national defense over the long pull or the long haul, certainly in the foreseeable future, and I trust that the Members of the House, bearing in mind that it will help not only the inductees and the Department of Defense in their long-range planning, but will also relieve the Members of Congress of the necessity of taking this up every 2 years, will vote the amendment down.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to say to the gentleman that I have been particularly impressed with the last suggestion that he has made, and that is this: By the action we take here today we serve notice to all that there shall be no slackening off in our determination to defend ourselves and protect ourselves. I think that is the most potent argument of all. Of course, as a Nation of unmilitary or nonmilitary people, none of us likes selective service. We did not like it in the beginning, and we do not like it any more now. But, as long as the situation in the world continues as it is, in my opinion there is no course for us to take except to see to it that we have the necessary men in our Armed Forces and that they are there for the security of the Nation.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEATING. Would it not be fair to say also that if the millenium should arrive or some great change in international affairs should take place——

Mr. SHORT. Which we cannot reasonably expect.

Mr. KEATING. Which we should not expect, yet it is open to us at any time during the 4-year period to amend this law and to approach it from that point of view rather than cutting down the period at this time when international affairs look so critical.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is eminently correct. I think the 4-year extension would have a great psychological and beneficial effect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Would the gentleman from Missouri care to comment upon the close relationship that a 4-year extension of selective service will have on the new Reserve plan we started to consider this morning in committee?

Mr. SHORT. I do not know that I can comment intelligently upon that. Of course, the Reserve plan has not yet been reported to the House. A subcommittee of our full committee started hearings on that, I understand, today. The gentleman I am sure is more familiar with that than I.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. We started hearings this morning and we find that the selective service is very closely related to the overall Reserve plan that we hope to write into a law.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VORYS. I commend the gentleman for a very compelling statement of the reasons for continuing this law. Is it not true that one of the things we are trying to do is to maintain peace by avoiding a war of miscalculation?

Mr. SHORT. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Twice we have gotten into war because our enemies thought we would not fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Referring to the resolution on page 2 it says "(62 Stat. 410)." I cannot find any "62 Stat. 410" that has anything to do with this. I wonder if it should not be 610?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say first of all that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan can get that information elsewhere.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. Is it in order to move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly it is.

Mr. BURDICK. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, it is harder to get speech in this Congress than it is to get out of the Army. As everyone knows, I am in favor of being ready. There is no one in the United States smart enough to know how to plan. They are talking about a 4-year plan. They do not know anything about it because it is not within their control. We will plan according to what the enemy does. And when that time comes we will have plenty of time to do planning, as we have always done in the history of this country.

I think a 2-year period is long enough because remember that democracy ends to them when these million men are inducted. With them democracy ends for that period of time and 2 years is long enough. I think the Constitution also ends, because under the Constitution you cannot have men serving in foreign countries unless there is a declaration of war against that country. But they serve there just the same.

As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] says, you can view this situation again. There is no logic in the amendment of the gentleman heading this committee. I admire him. And that statement is not made for the purpose of decapitating him. I admire him as most of the Members do. But I do not agree with his logic. The very fact that we are here now indicates that we can come in at the proper time and extend this draft. If that is not the case, why are we here now 6 months before this act expired? Two years from now you can come in again and you may want to induct 4 million men instead of 1 million. Let this country protect itself and be ready for whatever happens, but do not plan a 4-year course when the next Congress may have more information than we now have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 18 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee, this time not to include the time allotted to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has already been recognized.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as this bill is being considered my mind goes back to September 1951, when a similar bill was before the Congress to extend the then Selective Service Act. That bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 202 to 201.

On that occasion I made remarks that are still strongly impressed on my mind. One of my remarks, and this impression of mine is based upon experience, was that the most dangerous period in a democracy is when danger is imminent. In a world of peace we can have malfeasance, nonfeasance, and misfeasance in office, but the people are able to take care of it in their own way at the ballot box. In time of war the laws of self-preservation apply to ourselves and to our country. Whether we agree or disagree with the policies of an administration, we have to support it because the laws of self-preservation call for such action. It is in the period in between peace and when war occurs, the period of what I call imminent danger, that we must be very careful in what we do.

I think it is self-evident that the world is in a very disturbed situation. I think it is unnecessary for me to make any remarks about it at this time that might tend to alarm, because the people of our country and the people of the world realize the world situation. But you and I are elected by one-hundred-and-sixty-odd millions of Americans from our districts to represent them in this body and to exercise our judgment to the best extent we possibly can in the national interest of our country not only for today but for tomorrow.

While I am not in agreement with some of the views about the reduction in the Army, that is not involved today. I am very much concerned about the sharp reduction in the Army that is taking place, and I hope it will be reconsidered in the near future because I think world conditions call for it from our angle. It is not a question of whether we have a strong military organization but whether it is strong enough in relation to manpower, and particularly firepower of the military organization of the Soviet Union and its satellites. But that is a debate for another day.

We have before us a measure which is of vital concern to the national interest of our country. Directly before us now is the question whether we should extend this law for a 2-year period from July 1 of this year or for a 4-year period. My judgment, projecting my mind ahead, is that it is in the best interest of our country if we extend it for the 4-year period.

I am unable to agree with my dear friend from North Dakota when he says that democracy ends for those in the service. I am sure he did not mean exactly that, because those of us who served in our own little way thought we were serving to preserve democracy, and I am sure that is what my dear friend meant. What I think he means is that the complete freedom of a civilian is taken away from those in the service, and of necessity that must be so.

The other day when the Formosan resolution was up I voted for that basically because to me it represented firmness and strength. It also represented the unity of the people of the United States as expressed by the Members of this House and the Members of the other body. I was proud of the vote of this body—409 to 3—because if ever there was a manifestation of unity, if ever there was a manifestation of courage on the part of public officials, and if ever there was a manifestation of strength and firmness on the part of the Representatives of the people in this Congress, it was there expressed, clearly and unmistakably in the vote which was taken on that occasion. I think we are faced with another similar situation in this vote. The same basic questions are involved in the amendment before the Committee of the Whole at the present time. I think a vote for a 4-year service is one of firmness and strength. I think as between 2 years and 4 years that it is a message which will be more clearly understood by the potential enemy than the adoption of a 2-year extension. It is true during the next 2 years Congress can act, but I think it is a manifestation of firmness and strength. On the question of coordinating our facilities and processing our facilities in connection with our national defense, it seems to me that a 4-year period is decidedly in the best interests of our people and in the national interest of our Nation. For reasons which I have expressed, profoundly respecting the views of those who disagree with me, as I do, I hope the amendment to reduce the period of the extension to 2 years will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, limiting debate, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, almost every speaker in behalf of this bill this afternoon, has in some form or another referred to assurances to our so-called allies as the necessity for this 4-year extension. Well, I might ask—what allies—in view of the lack of participation by most foreign governments at the present time and during the war in Korea. But where does this assurance to our allies originate? Turn to page 16 of the hearings to a statement submitted by Secretary of Defense Wilson to the House Committee on Armed Services. I read just one sentence:

> The extension of this law represents another assurance to our allies that the size and effectiveness of our armed services will be maintained at the planned level.

About the same time that Secretary of Defense Wilson was making this statement, a press dispatch from Paris reported that France, one of the allies to whom we allegedly must offer assurance, was planning further cuts in its military contribution to the defense of Western Europe. France's tactic of making sweeping promises but never producing is an old story. Back in 1949, the French promised to contribute 35 to 40 divisions for Western European defense. That was soon cut to 28 and in 1952 was further reduced to 21; and in 1953 the goal went down to 18 divisions and by the end of that year it was discovered that the French in reality were making plans for only slightly more than 14 divisions. Now it is reported, and not denied, that actually French planning calls for no more than 12 understrength and underequipped divisions for Western European defense. How fantastic it is, quoting the Secretary of Defense, that we must give "assurance to our allies" that thousands of American boys will continue to be drafted for 4 years of military service when this so-called ally refuses to make more than a token contribution toward defending itself.

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by this unreciprocated assurance to foreign governments.

I am disturbed by the period of service here proposed. I am disturbed by the drafting and sending overseas of men involuntarily, and subjecting them to the Status of Forces Treaty. I doubt if the Armed Services Committee has made on-the-spot inquiries since that Status of Forces Treaty went into effect as to the conditions under which American soldiers have been tried in the civil courts of foreign countries, and under what conditions they are serving in foreign prisons. There are many things that ought to be looked into before this Draft Act is extended for 4 years.

I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] limiting the extension to a period of 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask our distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], if he does not feel that the extension of the draft for 4 more years might not preface the drive to bring universal military training back before us in this House.

Mr. SHORT. On the contrary, I think it would have the opposite effect. That is one of the reasons why I would like to see the Draft Act extended for 4 years. It will make unnecessary the passage of the so-called Universal Military Training Act.

Mr. POWELL. I wish you would just explain that to me. I remember in days gone by we defeated UMT; now this seems to be a part of the package deal that includes UMT.

Mr. SHORT. No. The gentleman asked me an honest question. I know he was absolutely honest, and I have tried to give him an honest answer. One of the reasons, in addition to the three I have already given for extending this act for 4 years, is that I hope before it expires the international situation will greatly improve, and there will be no necessity for passing the UMT Act, even in any modified form. That is one of the imponderable and unpredictable things that neither you nor I, nor any other man, with our finite minds can probe the depths or accurately prognosticate. I just have the feeling that if we continue this present law for 4

years perhaps we will not need UMT, although I may say to the gentleman—and he knows my position very well—I know the very valuable assistance the gentleman gave in the fight we made when we won by a margin of 73 votes in defeating the passage of UMT. I will say that my mind is open to the consideration of any bill that is brought before our committee. I must confess that the matter is now being considered by a subcommittee, and a study is being made of our manpower problem. Although I am not yet convinced that I could support this modified UMT, because it still has many bugs in it, I admit it is the best study that has thus far been made. However, that is completely divorced from the present legislation.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, because of a profound spiritual conviction against any peacetime conscription. To me, this is part of a package deal that is going to lead to it. A 2½-year extension of the draft is plenty of time to meet any crisis. In fact, the more imminent the crisis the less time needed to meet it. In fact in this 2½ years we will know whether we are going to be alive or not. This crisis is going to come to a head one way or another within the next 2½ years.

This is a giveaway program, to give away our young people and our homes, and a portion of our democracy, too. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was right.

This is a drafting of Congress. If we pass a 4-year extension, it will be drafting the 85th Congress and shackling public opinion that they would represent if they came here. There is absolutely no reason for this except that our Commander in Chief and our Pentagon want it.

I respect our Commander in Chief, no one here has greater esteem for our President, but I believe the House of Representatives should be representative of the people. You know and I know that the people of the United States of America, the mass of the voters, the young people, all of the religious organizations, every one of them, are opposed to an extension of the draft for 4 years.

If you vote for this amendment, you are voting for unity, for national preparedness, for democracy, and you are voting for the protection of the finest of our American life, our young people and our homes.

If you vote for 4 years, you are giving away Congress, you are giving away our young people, you are shackling the opinion of the 85th Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes. I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] in his clear and coherent reasoning. His reasoning is fundamental and essentially correct, that we need to have a show of strength at the present time.

I think that by cutting the draft extension down to 2 years, we would be making a serious mistake. The committee has agreed unanimously to the 4-year extension. I think we are fooling these young people throughout the United States if we make it less. When you and I go home, we are faced by these young men who want to know what their future may be. They have been watching the action of Congress in the extending of this act from time to time for short periods of time and they have entertained the hope that at the end of a comparatively short period of time, if they could drag this thing out, there might be the possibility that they might not have to render this service under the Selective Service Act. That hope is a false hope, and we are doing our part to carry in the hearts of some of them the false hope that eventually by dragging this thing out they will avoid military service. I think as Members of Congress we ought not to encourage them in that false hope.

This is a long-term obligation and it is going to be with us for a long, long time. To adopt this amendment and cut this extension of time down and make them feel that perhaps by going to school and getting a few deferments, or getting deferments for some other reason, they can drag out the time and thereby avoid the obligation of selective service, is the wrong way to handle this matter. The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIER) there were—ayes 62, noes 153.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (ch. 922, 64 Stat. 797), as amended by the act of March 23, 1953 (ch. 8, 67 Stat. 6), is further amended by striking out "July 1, 1955" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1959."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: On page 2, following line 2, insert a new section as follows:

"Section 6 (h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after the first proviso the following: '*Provided further*, That no person otherwise found, on his individual status, to be eligible for deferment because of his employment which is determined to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, as herein provided, shall be granted a deferment on account of the existence of a shortage of any agricultural commodity, or denied a deferment on account of a surplus of any agricultural commodity'."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for several years now the Selective Service System has been denying deferments to agricultural workers otherwise entitled thereto when local draft boards think that crops raised by these agricultural workers are in surplus. The purpose of my amendment is to put a stop to that.

Mr. Chairman, under the law industrial and agricultural workers are deferred when their employment is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. That must be determined upon their individual status and the President is authorized and directed to draft regulations to carry out the intention of the Congress with respect thereto. The regulations that we have had in force for years provide three criteria for determining whether or not an agricultural or an industrial worker is entitled to deferment.

The first is that he must be actually engaged in a necessary occupation. Second, he must show he cannot be replaced and, third, that his removal would cause material loss of effectiveness in such activity.

An agricultural deferment must be measured by whether or not the worker produces for market a substantial quantity of agricultural commodities necessary for the national health, safety, or interest. The formula for determining that is in the regulations.

The Selective Service System, without regard to those regulations, has proceeded to add a new requirement. It has provided that even where all three of the situations required by the regulations are present and the registrant is therefore entitled to deferment, yet in spite of that fact he shall not be deferred if in the opinion of the local draft board the crop he is producing is in surplus.

To show you to some extent the absurdity of such a regulation, let us apply that to a wheat crop that might be produced. A man shows to the satisfaction of the draft board that he is actually engaged in producing that crop of wheat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell me where the draft board got that idea that he has just expressed?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have no idea on earth. They got it out of the air.

The power to determine which crops are in surplus is the power to control the agricultural production of the Nation.

If any agency of the Government should have such power, it should not be the military or a bureau whose sole function is to procure manpower for the military.

In his statement the other day before the Committee on Armed Services, General Hershey tells how it is determined whether or not a crop is in surplus. Here is what he says:

We get that probably from the newspapers, from the Department of Agriculture, from the list of storages, and all that sort of thing. Now, that is a fact. We interpret it in different ways.

Should the agricultural supply of the Nation be determined by what the officials of the Selective Service System read

in the newspapers or learn from a list of storages?

The effect of this policy can be seen from these figures: For the year ending June 30, 1945, in the midst of desperate war, agriculture accounted for 5.7 percent of all deferments, but in the year ending June 30, 1954, agriculture accounted for but six-tenths of 1 percent of deferments.

Mr. Chairman, the policy does not make sense; it is unjust, it is not supported by law, and it should be stopped.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that he appeared before the committee and discussed this amendment. I have had the privilege of examining it, and as far as I am concerned, I have no objection, personally, to accepting this amendment. I would like to incorporate what I interpret the amendment to mean, if the gentleman has no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No.

Mr. VINSON. As I have stated, there is no objection as far as I am individually concerned. I cannot accept it as a committee amendment, because the committee has never passed on it. But, here is what the amendment does.

Once the amendment has become law, local boards will no longer be able to take into consideration the existence of a shortage of any agricultural commodity, or the existence of a surplus of any agricultural commodity in deciding whether or not a man should be deferred.

In other words, local boards will have to decide whether a man's employment is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, but in arriving at this determination they will be precluded from taking into consideration the existence of a surplus of an agricultural commodity, or the existence of a shortage of an agricultural commodity.

All other factors can be considered, but the supply of an agricultural commodity may not be taken into consideration either for granting deferments or denying deferments.

Now, is that a correct interpretation to be placed upon this amendment?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am individually concerned, I accept the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is a good amendment, a sound amendment. I think General Hershey made a mistake when he sent out that directive. Personally I am in favor of the amendment and I know of no objection on the minority side of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said that General Hershey sent out that directive. What directive is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. SHORT. The directive to the boards that they should not defer men engaged in production of surplus crops in agriculture.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means the one in January 1945?

Mr. SHORT. Where there is a surplus of an agricultural product.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not know he sent out any directive like that.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. General Hershey did not send out that directive. It was an arrogation by some of the boards. That is the reason for this amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Then I certainly want to withdraw my statement. I understood the directive was sent out by General Hershey.

Mr. RIVERS. He denied it.

Mr. SHORT. Then I withdraw my statement and I apologize to General Hershey.

Mr. RIVERS. This makes it plain how far they can go, and it takes it on a local level. They have to adjudicate it locally and not nationally.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. It was not sent out originally by General Hershey, but he approved it, and for that reason we want to change the law.

Mr. SHORT. Whether he originated it or approved it, it was bad, in my opinion, and I think the gentleman's amendment will correct the abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error. On line 13, page 2, where the figure "410" appears, it should be "610."

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, now you have taken away the only amendment I expected to get through.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 610), as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That no person who has been or may be deferred under the provisions of this clause shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 6 (h) of this title after he has attained the 26th anniversary of the date of his birth."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the query that I should like to address to the members of the committee comes appropriately at this point.

I have received from Mr. E. S. Foster, the general secretary of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, a telegram stating:

In extension Selective Service Act we strongly urge law provide that registrants 23 years and older should be drafted only after available registrants in younger age group have been inducted. Induction of older men who have become farmers in their own right when many younger men are standing by waiting for induction is unsound. Such procedure means tough adjustment for established farmers in the late twenties when they cannot possibly be of as much value to the armed services as the younger men. It often means breaking up families and liquidating farm business at great sacrifice. Supply of younger men greatly exceeds induction rate. Most younger men want to satisfy military requirements as early as possible. Under present situation large numbers of young men and many older men who have been deferred for agricultural purposes are left dangling in an atmosphere of uncertainty which is not good.

May I ask the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee whether, in the consideration of the bill, this precise problem was presented and how the committee has resolved it?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that a representative of the Farm Bureau appeared and suggested to the committee the proposed amendment that the gentleman has just read. After considerable discussion with him and after discussion in the committee, we rejected it because everyone has the right to volunteer any time he sees fit. There is nothing in the world to prevent a boy before he becomes 23 or 24 or 25 from volunteering. Therefore, he has no valid complaint when he is drafted at that age having passed over an opportunity to volunteer at a younger age. We rejected it with all deference to the position of the great Farm Bureau.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the explanation of the chairman. It has come to my attention that there have been a number of cases where older men in their late twenties engaged in agricultural pursuits have been called whereas, for some reason, a neighbor who is in his early twenties or perhaps 19 has not yet served.

Mr. VINSON. It all depends upon the age of the group in the pool. Under the law today you cannot draft anyone 18½ years of age if there are any in the pool that are 19 years of age or over. We are now drafting in the 21-year-age group in certain sections. In other sections the pool age limit will be higher. It all depends upon the pool and how many people are in the pool.

In some sections of the county if a farmer is in his 25th year he will be drafted and in another section they may draft them at age 21. Anyhow, they have the right to volunteer any time they see fit to do so for induction for 2 years.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the chairman's explanation. It seems to me the New York State Farm Bureau Federation which is a thoroughly patriotic and highly valuable organization has

raised a point which is deserving of the most thoughtful consideration.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I had a similar telegram and some of the questions I asked earlier were based on that.

Mr. KEATING. I think this is a problem of which we all ought to be conscious. I appreciate the explanation made by the members of the committee. But I must add that the Farm Bureau has certainly presented a problem which coincides with some personal experiences I have had in the administration of the existing draft law.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think there is one thing we do not wish to lose sight of. The fact is that if the board defers one man, under similar conditions it must defer another man. So if you lower the ages, you are going to have the mothers hollering about a certain group of people, "Why do you take these young men, who are not able to go out and face the world, when you allow older men not to serve?"

Mr. KEATING. That may be so but my understanding of the position taken by the Farm Bureau is that their only contention is that the older men who have become established and often have families dependent on them should not be called until after the younger men without family obligations or established pursuits.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Section 6 (b) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 410), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except section 4 (i) and paragraph (5) of this subsection, no person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 6 months or more in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or for a period of 24 months or more in the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.'"

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: On page 2, after line 24, add the following: "Section 6 (h) is amended by striking out 'That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the 35th anniversary of the date of their birth', and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'That persons who have or are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section for educational, study, or research purposes shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the 35th anniversary of the date of their birth.'"

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to correct an inequity of increasing proportions in existing law. Very simply, it provides that the maximum age for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be 26 years, except for men who have been deferred for study, educational, or research purposes.

The present military program of the President and the Department of Defense contemplates very material reductions in the size of our Army. The testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower indicates that 240,909 men have been examined and found acceptable for military service under present standards. Even at the present rejection rate, it is estimated that more than 800,000 other men, still not examined, are physically and mentally qualified for induction.

Department estimates indicate that the monthly draft call will average about 14,000 men at the present rate of enlistment and under current needs. This is 168,000 men a year.

This means, Mr. Chairman, that if not another man comes of age for induction from this day forward, inductions can continue for over 5 years.

Since approximately 800,000 men each year attain the age of 18½, it is clear that every man eligible for induction under present circumstances cannot possibly be required to serve.

The point I make is that regardless of the purpose or significance of the action taken in 1951 in removing the word "Selective" from the title of the law, the system contained in the law is necessarily selective. The title may now read "Universal Military Training and Service Act" but the real facts of the situation require that men be selected to serve or inductions would exceed many times over the President's manpower estimates.

In passing this act in June of 1951, the Congress rejected what was then proposed as a universal military training plan, adopting only the words for a title. Is this action of the Congress without significance?

The law, you will recall, clearly states:

The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privilege of serving in the Armed Forces and Reserve components thereof should be shared generally in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

This language has been read by the Director of Selective Service to mean that "the only question is when, not whether, a man shall be inducted." If this be true, what is the meaning of the words "system of selection"?

When we are inducting 14,000 men a month out of 1 million known to be qualified, with new thousands becoming eligible each day, there is no need to pretend that the process of induction is not selective.

Any selection by its very nature implies standards for choosing. It is these standards that I am trying to clarify by my amendment. The Director has said:

I think the Congress ought to be sure that the law is clear enough that even I could understand it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Director has given us sound advice and that we ought to face up to the realities of the present situation. The Department and the Director point with pride to the fact that 6.1 percent of the men inducted last year were over the age of 26.

Service for the sake of service is a new concept in American life. In a Nation that has been traditionally suspicious of militarism for the sake of militarism, it is a concept foreign to both our experience and our philosophy. We have raised armies in time of need and will continue to do so, but we have never held that men should be conscripted without grave cause.

As I have said, selective service implies a standard for choosing and it implies that those best able and best qualified to serve be called. When we are limiting the number of men to be called, it is logical that those best suited be called in the national interest.

I am sure that every Member of Congress has been informed of cases which would indicate that qualifications are completely disregarded and men are inducted for the sake of induction. This is certainly true in many cases in the age group above 26.

Recently in my district, a man who was 29 years of age was inducted despite a silver spike in his heel, the result of an accident. He is now assigned to limited service and presumably will spend his next 2 years in that category.

In other cases, men over 26 were inducted because they failed to use the proper form in advising boards that children were conceived before August 25, 1953, the date fixed by the President in his order ending deferments for fathers. Despite the fact that the date of birth indisputably fixed the date of conception prior to August 25, Selective Service held the fathers eligible for induction on various technicalities. In one case, the registrant notified the board in writing, though improperly. The clerk intended to advise him that the proper form required a physician's affidavit but neglected to do so.

I am not an attorney but I am sure that the demands of justice were clear in this case from every viewpoint of commonsense which we regard as basic to wise and good administration of any law. If Congress did not intend this to be so, certainly the law could be more simply drawn without so great a reliance upon human judgment throughout its operation.

Day after day these cases continue to come to our attention. Most of them involve men in the upper age groups who have had the period of liability extended because of previous deferments. Many of them, of course, would not have occurred if the men had been inducted at

an earlier age. Some of them, it is true, could have volunteered for induction but in other cases the reasons for deferment were so compelling that volunteering was impossible.

Therefore, in view of the decision of the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reduce our ground forces, it does not seem desirable or necessary to induct men over 26 except in special cases where they are not sufficiently trained in the special skills needed by the services until after that age.

Almost without exception, our military commanders, including General Eisenhower, have testified before the committees of Congress that they need younger men better suited to military service and more likely to be available in future emergencies. This was one of the arguments used so forcefully to obtain authority for induction at age 18½. If the argument had validity then, it does now.

Within a few years most of the men in the upper age group under present law will be either unfit or ineligible for service should an emergency occur. There are special cases in which men require longer periods of education, study, or research, before they can make their full contribution to the services. In such cases, they would remain liable for service under my amendment to age 35 as they are at present.

However, the great body of inductees who are assigned to the ground forces are available at an early age and better qualified then for the purposes of military service. Service then does not interrupt family life or establishment of a lifetime occupation on the farm, in the factory, or in business. In the overwhelming number of cases it is to the young man's advantage to complete his service while in the lower age group.

Moreover, such a policy would be eminently in keeping with our tradition of encouraging family life as the basic unit of a sound and stable Nation. If the present situation warrants drastic reductions in our standing forces, it seems impossible to me to justify the utter disregard for the good of the family which is the ultimate good of the Nation.

It will be said that this amendment removes the liability for induction of men now in the upper age group. It does, but it does so on the same selective basis already created by the real facts of our present military situation. If all men eligible for induction are not needed and cannot be called under manpower limitations, then it must be decided which group is best able to serve.

If this can be called discriminatory, it is so only in the sense that military service by its very nature is discriminatory, and particularly so if it is selective. Mental and physical qualifications established for induction in themselves cause selection.

Last year there were already nearly 2 million persons deferred for physical and mental reasons and its is estimated that in the future 30 percent of all the men reaching 18½ will be deferred for such reasons. They will not be called upon to serve under present conditions.

When men are inducted, the process of selection, or discrimination if you prefer, continues. Some men are assigned as infantry riflemen, others are assigned as officers' mess boys. Some are assigned to the United States, others are assigned to Korea. The very needs of the service result in selection.

Any examination of the work performed by men in service reveals that at least 80 percent—and some make higher estimates—is noncombat duty. This figure even excludes such combat-related duties as field maintenance or field feeding. So the percentage of men inducted who are expected to engage in actual combat is a relatively small percentage indeed.

Now the Armed Forces must decide which men are best qualified to carry a rifle and which are best qualified for a desk at the Pentagon. We recognize this as necessary and do not imply unworthy motives of discrimination.

Similarly, it is wise and proper to make selection before induction for the whole good of the Nation. This was recognized by provisions of the law establishing first exemptions and then deferments. If our military chiefs now decide that the Armed Forces can be reduced, it is necessary that the process of selection be extended.

In extending this process, it is sensible and essential that we take into account both the welfare of the individual and the welfare of the Nation. By both of these standards, it would seem that the upper age group is best established in the community and least valuable to the Armed Forces except in the special cases I have cited.

The interruption of family life has dire consequences for the whole community and can be warranted only in the most serious emergency. By the same token, young men have a right to know with some degree of certainty under present circumstances at what point they can establish a family without the threat of interruption and the resulting financial and personal hardship.

Operation of a family farm, for example, is not the kind of occupation that can be interrupted for 2 years after a man has reached 26 or 28 and must leave a young wife with several children to carry on. Yet we know that such cases occur each day under the present law when no realistic appraisal of the manpower situation can possibly warrant such action.

You have been told today that in some areas State directors have advised local boards to consider the supply of farm commodities in reaching a decision on deferments. By what standards should the local boards determine if a commodity is regarded as surplus? The Director of Selective Service told the Committee on Armed Services:

> In the first place, I have no desire to determine surplus. We get that probably from newspapers, from the Department of Agriculture, from the list of storages and all that sort of thing. Now, that is fact. We interpret it in different ways.

Surely this standard is not acceptable to anyone familiar with the complexities of modern agriculture and with the Nation's need for productive farms in the years just ahead.

The same arguments can be made in business and industry, which, like agriculture, need a degree of stability to insure steady progress in building and maintaining the kind of economy necessary to support the defense effort required in our time.

One further question which cannot be overlooked is that of cost to the Government. The number of dependents of servicemen in the upper age group is clearly larger than for the younger group. Therefore we have not only the cost of training with the knowledge that the soldier probably cannot be recalled in a future emergency but adequate dependency allowances must also be paid. And the possibility of ailments developing for which later benefits must be paid certainly increases in direct relation to the age group involved.

I am mindful, Mr. Chairman, of the realities of the present world situation which require us to maintain forces in sufficient strength to provide an adequate defense and to deter aggression. The President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff assure us that their manpower estimates will provide such a force.

It is important, therefore, that the force be provided in such a way as to insure the most efficient use of manpower in both the military and civilian economy. I think the amendment before you will correct some of the inequities now existing while at the same time improve the services by the induction of the men best qualified for the present and the future.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. So the issue can be clear before the Committee, the gentleman is making it applicable only to educational deferments that a man can be drafted over 26 years of age?

Mr. MARSHALL. What I am saying is that except for those who have been deferred for educational, research, or study purposes, all others between 26 and 35 would be exempted.

This is a comparatively simple amendment. We have been faced with a rather odd situation which was mentioned on the floor earlier today. The Army has lowered its mental requirements and its physical requirements, and one of the things that that has brought about has been the induction of people who were previously exempt from induction. That has brought these people into the service at a later period in their lives and it has created uncertainty among the local boards because they do not know exactly what to do in connection with some of these people. They have no way they can find to exempt them and, therefore, they induct them. They induct them into the service and the Army as a rule does not want them. They do not want them because their years of service are certainly limited and their ability to take the rigors of training is somewhat limited. We had an odd thing happen. I know of one young man, 29 years of age, who was inducted in my district. He has a

crushed ankle and a silver spike in that ankle. He was inducted at the age of 29 years. The Army doctors examined him and they immediately said he is subject to limited service. All I am doing by this amendment is to exempt those who have previously been deferred for hardship reasons or for any other of a number of reasons, and to permanently exempt those between the age of 26 and 35 who are presently subject to induction. I am making an exception. I am saying that those who are granted deferments to complete their education or to engage in research or to engage in the numerous other things that some of these people were exempt for in the way of education will not be deferred, and they are subject to induction into the Army to complete their period of service as I justly think they should be. That was the obligation of the contract that they entered into. Then I again want to repeat, this merely exempts those who at the age of 26 to 35 are available for induction. I am granting permanent deferment to those men. I think that is the thing that local boards desire, and I think it is the thing that local communities desire. I cannot for the life of me see any purpose in inducting that group of men into the armed services. The testimony before the committee itself said that this past year this group only made up 6 percent of the number inducted. That 6 percent includes people who were previously deferred to get their education and to get their training and for research and other purposes. It seems to me this would be a good and fair way to handle this problem. I hope that the chairman of the committee who is such an outstanding American and who so thoroughly understands these things agrees with me. I am sure he would agree with me if he understood fully what I am trying to say. I am sure he must understand what I am talking about. I am sure he wants a strong armed services. I am sure he wants one of the best armed services we can possibly get. I am sure we are going to get a better and a more vigilant and a more useful Armed Force and get a better training program, if my amendment is accepted.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the gentleman from Georgia accepts my amendment and I am glad now to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman for the compliments, but I am sorry to say that notwithstanding I have to disagree with you because what you accomplish will, as I mentioned today, free these people from induction. As I said, there are 17,000 occupational deferments. Under your amendment, everyone of those 17,000 men would go free of liability for induction if they reached the age of 26. Under the law today they are liable to age 35. The only people your amendment will hold are those engaged in research, educational work or studies. But so far as all occupational deferments are concerned, if they are still deferred when they reach 26 years of age, you turn them loose and they will have served the country at no time and yet have received constant deferments because of their occupation. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a high regard for the gentleman from Georgia, but I must disagree with you to the extent that you use the word "occupational deferment."

Mr. VINSON. Well, that is what it is.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would almost be inclined to agree with you to an extent if you were to say it was a hardship deferment, but I believe there has been ample testimony before your committee in favor of this younger group. I believe someone testified before your committee saying that if your present policies were carried out in connection with the age limits before you would get a group at the present rate of induction that is needed for the armed services, some of the men would be 90 years of age before they would have a chance to serve their country.

Is that right? That is before your committee, is it not?

Mr. VINSON. I am sorry to say I could not follow the gentleman on that. But go ahead and make your statement.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this? Are there not ample people in the age limits below 26 to fill all of the requirements this country is going to have?

Mr. VINSON. What the gentleman is driving at is to have this burden fall exclusively almost on the shoulders of the younger group each year as they come in, and let out those in the over 26-year group. Now it is not fair. These other people owe an obligation as well as the 18-year-old boys.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think my amendment is fair.

Mr. VINSON. I hope this amendment is voted down. I think the committee understands the purport of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARSHALL) there were—ayes 15, noes 106.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 3, line 1, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 6 (h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (602 Stat. 611) as amended, is amended by inserting before the word 'shall' in the second proviso the following: 'except persons deferred at any time by reason of having been found to be physically or mentally unfit for service by an Armed Forces examining or induction station'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has done the committee the kindness to consult with us in the preparation of the phraseology of the amendment. It was discussed in general debate. It is now in such language that I think we can with propriety accept it. The committee understands what it is, and it was clearly disclosed in the general debate.

The committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 2, line 24, add a new subsection as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (h) (2) (B) of section 6, add the following subsection reading as follows:

"'(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation, or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this Act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal, shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work'."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the Tydings amendment, so-called.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, it is possible I may be absent from the Chamber at the time the vote is taken on this bill. If so, and I could be present, I would vote for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the so-called Tydings amendment which the Congress wrote into the law when the draft act was earlier before us and again when the act was extended.

I understand an attempt was made to remedy the situation by the amendment which was accepted by the chairman of the committee, and which was adopted earlier today. But under the law as it is written even with that amendment there is doubt about what will happen to farm workers.

This amendment is offered because the armed services just does not pay proper attention to the laws which the Congress enacts; and I would like to make it clear to the departments if I may, that when we write a law we would like to have the executive department execute it.

To substantiate what I say I am reading a directive issued by General Hershey on the 3d day of January 1945. The directive follows:

EXHIBIT B

State Director Advice (No. 288) Issued: January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18–25.

(Confirmation of telegram to all State directors within continental United States dated January 3, 1945.)

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18- through 25-year-age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year-age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator Tydings said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18- through 25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18- through 25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

That directive created so much criticism that the general issued another one on the 23d day of the same month.

The second directive follows:

EXHIBIT C

State Director Advice (No. 288–A) Issued January 23, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of Registrants in Agriculture, Ages 18–25.

(Confirming telegram to all State directors within continental United States dated January 22, 1945.)

Questions of interpretations of State Director Advice 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Director Advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Director Advice 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5k of the Selective Training and Service Act known as the Tydings amendment places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

HERSHEY.

(This telegram was dispatched only to State directors within the continental limits of the United States as it is not applicable in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.)

The result was that the State authorities instructed the local boards to disregard completely the Tydings amendment.

In support of that statement I cite the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1945, when this same issue was before us. Permit me to read a part of that debate.

At that time—February 1945—the Honorable Earl Michener—as capable, as industrious a Member as ever served in this House—addressed the House and called attention to the disregard of the provisions of this amendment by local authorities interpreting and administering the act. Permit me to quote:

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the Congress to the alarming condition in agricultural sections because of the interpretation being placed by local draft boards on General Hershey's directive of January 3, requiring the reclassification and induction of boys 18 through 25 years of age who were deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Then, referring to a statement issued by the local board, our former colleague said:

The above statement by the board was published on January 29, and in the evening of the same day Maj. Nick A. Luscombe, representing the Michigan State director of selective service, addressed a meeting in Lenawee County and made it clear that all farm registrants 18 through 25, who were physically qualified, were to be inducted into the military service, the Tydings amendment and the statutory law of the land to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman then added:

We are asking that the local boards, whose members live in the community and know the facts, be permitted and required to draft or defer under the provisions of the law provided by the Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 10, 79th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 2, 1945, pp. A411–A412.)

On the same subject, from the Well of the House, on February 5, 1945—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 1, page 829, 79th Congress, 1st session—will be found a statement which, taken in connection with what happened at that time, shows clearly that the executive departments do not follow the law as it is written by Congress:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the confusion which has arisen over the drafting of agricultural workers, in my judgment, can be laid to the directive of General Hershey issued on the 3d day of January 1945, No. 288. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] inquired of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] where there was any reason to charge the drafting of these men to the President. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] will read Directive No. 288—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 1, page 761—sent out by General Hershey he will find there quoted the statements of Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Jones, and in the statement signed by General Hershey, quoting Mr. Byrnes, it is stated:

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-to-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

There is where the trouble started, and you cannot get away from it. The fact is that after that order went out the local draft boards throughout the country, acting on it, as the President must have expected they would, began to ignore the Tydings amendment. They began to put men who were in II–C directly over into I–A, and to send them into the Army without any review as to whether they fell under the Tydings amendment and should be deferred. When they did that they disregarded their duty.

In my judgment, they are not to be criticized, because the idea that the Commander in Chief can do no wrong, make no mistake, has been stressed so often and so strongly by some papers, by Members of Congress, by almost every columnist, that as a practical matter the local draft boards had no choice.

I know what has happened and so do you. A local draft board which deferred these agricultural workers would have been charged, just as you and I have been charged during past months, with being disloyal, with aiding the enemy, with exempting men who were not entitled to be exempted, with refusing to support the war effort. Who is there in a local community who wants to

stand up to that kind of criticism from the daily press, from the administration, and the administration spokesmen?

There is more to the same effect to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Permit me to quote—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, page 2431, 79th Congress, 1st session, March 19, 1945:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether, if the present policy of General Hershey in disregarding the Tydings amendment is followed there will be a shortage of food, I do not know. * * *

I do know that notwithstanding the so-called corrective of the directive sent out by General Hershey some local boards were advised by selective service officials under General Hershey to disregard that corrective.

Similar complaints were made in the Senate. On April 23, 1945, Senator Shipstead of Minnesota, among other things, said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 3, page 3634, 79th Congress, 1st session:

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution which was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of practically 4-to-1, dealing with the question of drafting farm help, and its effect upon the production of agricultural products, and asking for the appointment of a joint committee of the House and the Senate to investigate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in order that there may be no further misrepresentation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

The purpose of this amendment is to call attention to the fact that, as long as there is a provision in the law which permits the President to use his discretion as to deferments, the will of the Congress will not prevail.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made the statement that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] took care of the situation. In my humble judgment, it does not take care of the situation, because, under the law as it would read, the President still has authority to make the rules and regulations governing deferments. This situation is not new, nor is the disregard by the executive department of legislation enacted by Congress new.

Please note that the House, by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 29, on March 19, 1945, recognized the necessity not only for the Tydings amendment, but for a further directive to the executive department.

We are today putting through legislation which gives the armed services control for a period of 8 years over the lives of every physically and mentally fit American young man.

Why enact a draft or conscription act which carries a loophole which will enable the executive department to conscript into the service individuals that the legislative department—the Congress—declares shall be entitled to deferment or exemption?

The amendment which I have offered is the Tydings amendment. It was debated in both Houses. It was adopted by a substantial majority in both Houses. After its terms had been disregarded by the armed services, the House and the Senate found it necessary to call attention to this maladministration. There would seem to be no reason why today, extending the act for 4 years, that Congress should not, in unequivocal terms, express its will.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will vote down any and all amendments at all times when it does not understand what the amendments are. That is good commonsense; it is good, sound philosophy. Outside of the gentleman from Michigan, I doubt that there is a Member on the floor who knows what is in this amendment.

I tried to follow the reading of the amendment as best I could, and we have a very able counsel who knows the selective-service law by heart, but the only thing that we could discover in it was that back in 1940, when there was an agricultural scarcity in this country, we were giving certain considerations to production so that certain favors were extended to persons engaged in agriculture.

The only thing that the committee thinks should have been corrected is that which we have corrected by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON]. So, I repeat, it will not help any legislation to legislate when you do not know what you are legislating about; when you do not know the substance of something that is as complicated as exemptions and deferments. The wisest thing, therefore, is to accept the gentleman's challenge and vote down his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is typical of the attitude of the armed services.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly right; it is typical of the Armed Services Committee because we never legislate with reference to things we know nothing about, and, unfortunately, the gentleman's amendment is in that category.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3005, is not a Universal Military Training Act; its title is a misnomer and will be greatly misunderstood by the people throughout the Nation.

Universal means all comprehensive, it means to include all, the whole and not a part of the whole. This bill will affect and include only those males who are 18½ years old and not over 26 years old; they must be physically fit, and retains them in the armed services only 24 months.

This bill is selective, not universal. It is an extension of the Selective Service Act and it should not be designated as a Universal Military Training Act, which it is not.

The American people are opposed to regimentation especially during a period of apparent peace. The American people are opposed to universal military training because it smacks too much of regimentation, unless our national security is seriously threatened and total mobilization of our manpower and resources is necessary. Today we are in a precarious situation as the leading nation in the free world. We must have sufficient manpower under arms ready and able to meet and defend any armed aggression which may threaten us.

Because of the threats, danger, and imminent peril we are facing from aggressive communism in many parts of the world, it seems to me we must pass this bill.

I am supporting it as an extension of the Selective Service Act which it is. I do not recognize it as a Universal Military Training Act, which in my opinion, it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, pursuant to House Resolution 133, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3005 to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 394, nays 4, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—394

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buchanan
Buckley
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Cole
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Ray
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—4

Burdick
Hoffman, Mich.
Mason
Smith, Kans.

NOT VOTING—36

Ayres
Bentley
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Budge
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chiperfield
Clevenger
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Dondero
Evins
George
Gubser
Harrison, Nebr.
Hillings
Holt
Hosmer
Jackson
Krueger
McGregor
Mailliard
Martin
Morano
Norblad
Norrell
O'Konski
Pelly
Radwan
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Smith, Wis.
Van Pelt

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one regrets more deeply than I the need to continue and extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I regret the need for any legislation which will serve to take our young men out of their homes and schools. I regret the need to interrupt their lives and plans from the peaceful pursuit of their education and professions. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that in this highly advanced age, society has not yet found the avenue to a lasting peace.

Much as I regret the need for this legislation, I am constrained to support it now as I did in our committee. As a matter of fact, I expressed grave doubts in committee as to the wisdom of the cut in our ground forces at this time. With the Communist threat looming larger and more serious every day, we must not, even in the slightest degree, lessen our defense effort or weaken our national security.

With our goal as peace, we must be so strong that no aggressor will dare to challenge us. We must never close the door to the conference room. We must, as we strengthen and fortify ourselves, proceed on the theory that peace is attainable and that war is not inevitable.

In supporting this legislation, I voice the hope and prayer that events prove it to have been unnecessary and that the safety of our country will never again require it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to all Members for extension of remarks on H. R. 3005, I would like to state for the record that illness prevented my being present to vote for the passage of this bill. The large vote by which it was passed speaks for the importance in which it is held and the unanimity of feeling of the Members of the House for its merits.

The world situation is one that calls for sacrifice, courage, and determination. We are faced with the inevitable requirement of maintaining an Army, a Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps for the indefinite future, of not less than 2,850,000. Our military experts have estimated and testified to the fact that voluntary enlistments cannot provide this number, essential to our national defense.

I believe that continuation of the draft for 4 years allows long-range planning for our Military Establishment, which is essential. I believe it also allows long-range planning for our youth, though it in nowise changes their period of service.

In the light of world conditions, this is necessary legislation—essential for the preservation of our Nation and of the free world.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement, to advise the membership that the Committee on the Judiciary has just reported out a pay-raise bill for Federal judges and Members of Congress, and if a rule is reported, which I expect will be, the bill will be brought up for consideration

in the House on Wednesday of next week, 1 week from tomorrow. I wanted the Members to be advised so that they might govern themselves accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OF DECEASED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 35, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Benefits Provided Under Federal Law for the Survivors of Deceased Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces the following Members of the House: Mr. HARDY of Virginia, chairman; Mr. KILDAY of Texas; Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. BATES of Massachusetts; Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

DESIGNATING MR. CRAMER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. At the suggestion of the minority leader, and pursuant to a special order agreed to on February 2, 1955, the Chair designates the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CRAMER, to read Washington's Farewell Address, immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1955.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report to accompany House Report No. 20 of the 84th Congress.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE CHARLES F. MARTIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the Chair and the House to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will feel very sorry to hear that our beloved colleague and distinguished former Speaker, the present minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, has sustained a great loss in the death of his beloved brother. Notwithstanding his bereavement he stayed here throughout the day performing his duty as a Member of Congress in the House on this important bill. We all deeply respect him for his devotion to duty which he has so clearly shown throughout the years.

I know that each and every one of us feel exceedingly sorry for JOE MARTIN and we extend to him and his loved ones our profound sympathy in his great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. On behalf of the Members on this side of the aisle I join the majority leader and other Members in expressing our deep sympathy and sorrow to our beloved minority leader, JOE MARTIN.

Death came to his brother unexpectedly last night while on his journey to Florida. Mr. MARTIN said he would stay here throughout the day but felt it was his duty to go home this evening. We all send with him our deepest sympathy in this hour of his bereavement.

HELP AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, recently, I proposed on the floor of the House that some effort be made to help the West Virginia victims of the reciprocal trade program.

I asked that a $175 million program be initiated to provide direct aid both to the victims of the scourge of unemployment which has followed our low tariff policy and the factory owners and coal mine operators who have been forced into bankruptcy for the same reason.

I am happy to report that my mail has overwhelmingly endorsed this proposal. The letters and telegrams have come not only from West Virginia, but from seven other States as well.

However, I am saddened by the fact that the most ardent supporters of the present free-trade policy have chosen to ignore the proposal. Although they are directly responsible for the ravages of unemployment in West Virginia, and other States in the Union, they have remained mute.

It means nothing to them that thousands of Americans have been thrown out of work. It means nothing to them that thousands of schoolchildren are deprived of the advantages of the good home and good food that weekly pay envelopes would assure them.

I sincerely hope that those who are depriving American workmen of their jobs and their right to make a living will consider this plan. Or, if they do not agree with it, let them offer something else.

Today they offer the most valuable market in the world to the foreign worker and they offer not a crust of stale bread to the unemployed American. This is not justice. This is not honesty.

If you strip a man of his job, then, I plead with you, give him another job in its place. Or, at least, give him the opportunity for a job.

Under my proposal the Federal Government would be empowered to conduct a far-reaching industrial survey of the State of West Virginia and report back a workable industrial plan to take up the slack in distress areas.

This is something that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to support. The State government of West Virginia did not force our industries into bankruptcy. The State government did not force our workers into idleness.

These conditions are the direct result of the trade policy of our Federal Government as approved by Congress. It is therefore up to Congress to act.

I wish to congratulate my colleague, Congressman HERMAN EBERHARTER, for his interest in this problem. Mr. EBERHARTER is an exception to my complaint that those who support free trade have ignored my proposal.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has proposed a plan of his own which would give help to the men and women who are unemployed because of free trade. I hope that others who have contributed to this unemployment will respond to their obligations to the unemployed as nobly and as wholeheartedly as Mr. EBERHARTER has done.

The advocates of our present free trade policy say that it is in the interest of stopping communism, and I agree, but should we not be interested in eradicating those conditions here at home as well as abroad, such as want and hunger that breed communism wherever they exist?

At the present time I am in the process of getting together all available data that will help me in preparing a proper resolution for introduction in the Congress. I feel that every Representative should be interested in this and should help, as it is not a local problem, but one of national consequence. The entire Congress cooperated in helping the sugar, tobacco, and cotton people because we knew of the nationwide importance resulting from anything that affected these industries.

My effort in this matter is to get something done for the unemployed in my State. If those that have been advocating free trade do not agree with me on this proposition, then they should offer something more concrete.

The proponents of free trade remind me of the man who had a sick child and heard that his neighbor also had a sick child. He immediately went to the aid of his neighbor and worked diligently in helping to doctor his neighbor's child, while all the time his own child was home ill and neglected.

It is my belief that charity begins at home, and it is time we looked after our own as well as the needy of the world.

THE LATE OSCAR E. HEWITT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Chicago and the Nation have lost a great public servant in the passing of Oscar

E. Hewitt. It is proper that his death should be noted here in the Congress of the United States.

Many years ago he and I were members of the editorial staff of John R. Walsh's Chicago Chronicle. Later he went to the Chicago Tribune, specializing in local government and local transportation. There he showed his tremendous capacity for work, never putting in less than 12 hours a day, frequently on a self-imposed 7-day schedule.

For two decades prior to his retirement in 1952 at the age of 75 he was commissioner of public works of the city of Chicago. He worked at the job 7 days a week. Always he showed up in the early hours of the morning, never later than 7 o'clock, on occasions as early as 5 o'clock. He was the last to leave the city hall in the evening, seldom before 6 or 7 o'clock, often much later. He took the minimum time for lunch, just time enough for a quick bite at a lunch counter, then back to his desk.

This schedule he lived by to the very last day of his official service.

The record of his industry, his integrity, which stood as the Rock of Gibraltar, his great accomplishments in the field of local government, in which perhaps he was the outstanding authority in the United States, should be preserved as a pattern for deportment in public affairs.

I grieve in the loss of a dear friend of a half a century.

Chicago grieves in the loss of one of her greatest sons and servitors.

THE FORCED REPATRIATION PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, ever since the end of World War II, there have been stories, articles, and reports which, in effect, allege that there were violations of the terms of the Yalta agreement and other secret agreements dealing with the repatriation program instituted with respect to displaced Russian nationals to the Russian Government. So long as this problem remains shrouded in secrecy and embarrassed silences, our American Nation will be besmirched and possibly even castigated for its part in that program.

Recently there appeared in the December 14, 1954, issue of the American Legion Magazine an article entitled "How We Served as Partners in a Purge" by Julius Epstein.

This article clearly demonstrates the need for a clarification of the wherefor of such a program. Repatriation, in and of itself, is a question of deep concern and distress. It is in the interest of our Nation that we determine this issue and cleanse the national record for all time.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I am today introducing a resolution for the creation of a committee of the Congress to conduct an investigation and study of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47. I sincerely trust that this resolution will be favorably reported and a committee appointed at the earliest possible moment in the interest of justice.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE NORTHWEST AIRLINES CASE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision, remanding his earlier orders denying the application of Northwest Airlines for authority to maintain through service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii, has pleased many of us. As things stand today, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been instructed by the President to draft orders authorizing Northwest Airlines and Pan American to continue operating this route on temporary basis for 3 years.

This decision is fair and consistent with the purposes and the intent of the Civil Aeronautics Act; the earlier one did not possess these virtues.

I am certain that the protests voiced earlier this week on this floor, and those conveyed directly to the White House, were instrumental in securing a reconsideration of the President's original decision on the Northwest Airlines' case. To my mind, these protests were valid, based on fact and reason. It is indeed gratifying that they produced results.

I have been deeply interested in the disposition of the Northwest Airlines' case not only since the President's decision of February 1, but for many months preceding that date. The issues involved were important because they involved the question of a national policy outlined by Congress, and because they seriously affected the transportation needs of Wisconsin and of other Midwestern States.

On June 3, 1954, Mr. H. O. Pihl, chairman of the aeronautics subcommittee of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, called to my attention the possibility that the services rendered by Northwest Airlines between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii were in danger of being discontinued.

Mr. Pihl's letter read as follows:

WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., June 3, 1954.

CLEM J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ZABLOCKI: It has been brought to our attention that the continuance of air service by Northwest Airlines, Inc., from Seattle to Hawaii is in danger of discontinuance.

The facts appear to be as follows:

This service was inaugurated by Northwest several years ago and has been conducted under a temporary authorization by the CAB.

There are now two airlines operating between Seattle and Hawaii—Pan American and Northwest—although it has been recognized that the route cannot feasibly be operated with financial success by more than one line. Northwest was the first to apply for this route back in 1943 but upon objection on the part of Pan American was denied a certificate in 1946. Thereafter the CAB reopened the case and in 1948 found that the service was necessary but that only one carrier could feasibly render it and directed that it be rendered by Northwest. This decision was approved by President Truman on July 29, 1948. Nevertheless, in September 1948 President Truman directed that Pan American also be given the right to operate paralleling service and both lines have operated since that time.

The rights then granted were merely temporary and there is now pending before the CAB applications to make them permanent. The examiner in this proceeding has again found that only one line should operate between Seattle and Honolulu but has recommended that Pan American be certificated and that Northwest be denied, despite the fact that it has carried more passengers than has Pan American.

Pan American lines do not extend into the interior from the west coast and the interests of Wisconsin would seem to be far better served by a single-line operator which could be used for the entire service between the State and Hawaii. Pan American would still be serving Hawaii from San Francisco and Los Angeles.

We would not be calling this to your attention if it were purely an administrative matter, but as we understand it, these overseas routes are the subject of Executive approval, veto, or even of initiation, as indicated by President Truman's action in 1948, and we feel that in view of the circumstances and the fact that the best interests of the State of Wisconsin favor the service of Northwest rather than Pan American, you might indicate to the President, if not the CAB, your opinion or desire in the matter.

No doubt we, the traffic committee of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, would have intervened in and been represented in the proceedings had we been aware of the danger in which the Northwest service was being placed. Your interest and any assistance you may be able to give in retaining that service, if the opportunity presents itself, would be greatly appreciated, and our appreciation, we believe, would be shared by the Wisconsin public generally.

H. O. PIHL,
Chairman, Aeronautics Subcommittee.

Upon the receipt of the above correspondence, I contacted Chairman Chan Gurney, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and advised him of the interest of Wisconsin businessmen in adequate air-transportation facilities. He assured me that, in reaching the final decision, the Board would weigh most carefully all the facts of record, and give thorough consideration to the Northwest proposal.

When I learned last week that the President instructed the CAB to deny the application of Northwest Airlines to continue through service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii, in spite of the fact that Northwest offered to operate without subsidy, I immediately contacted the White House and the CAB, urging

careful review of that decision. My letter to Gov. Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President, read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1955.

GOV. SHERMAN ADAMS,
Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR ADAMS: The announcement of the President's instructions to the Civil Aeronautics Board, recommending that that agency deny the application of Northwest Airlines for authority to maintain through service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii, and from Minneapolis-St. Paul to Tokyo via Edmonton, Alberta, and Anchorage, Alaska, has deeply disturbed the people of Wisconsin who have benefited from this service during recent years.

The Northwest Airlines' routes have constituted our important air outlets to the East, the West, and to the Pacific. Our businessmen have relied on this direct service to areas where they do business. Northwest Airlines has pioneered these routes, and they are important to Wisconsin's transportation needs.

The President's instructions were particularly disturbing in view of the Northwest Airlines' offer to fly the Seattle-Hawaii route without Government subsidies, as part of the carrier's plan to be free of all subsidies by the end of 1955, and in view of the fact that the instructions apparently failed to set forth the reasons for the President's decision.

I will appreciate being advised of the specific reasons which constitute the basis for the President's instructions, and I wish to urge careful reconsideration of the proposal to deny the above-mentioned applications of the Northwest Airlines. Will you kindly convey my sentiments on this subject to the President.

Respectfully yours,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

It was gratifying to learn subsequently that the President had amended his decision so as to allow both Northwest Airlines and Pan American to compete on the northern Hawaii route. Competition of this sort is good, and it benefits the public.

I should like to note at this point that there is another air route, important to the air transportation needs of Wisconsin and the entire Midwest, which was affected by the President's instructions to CAB of February 1, 1955. This is the northern overland route from Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul to the Orient. This route was pioneered by Northwest Airlines, and the President ordered the CAB to discontinue it.

In order to show how many Wisconsin businessmen feel about the importance of this route, I should like to read into the RECORD the telegram which I received earlier today from Mr. Ray H. Weisbrod, executive vice president of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce. The telegram is, I believe, self-explanatory.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 8, 1955.*

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Representative From Wisconsin,
House Office Building:

Milwaukee business highly pleased with President's decision to reverse his previous order and to authorize CAB to issue a 3-year extension to Northwest Airlines for continuation of profitable route from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii. We sincerely appreciate your effective action in this respect.

However, we are sorely disappointed that the President's latest action did not include reversal of his previous decision to eliminate the direct inner great circle route from Milwaukee to Alaska. We earnestly believe this route is basic to Wisconsin's future growth in domestic trade with Edmonton, Canada, and Anchorage, Alaska, as well as our foreign trade with the Orient. This is the most direct route of any American carrier to Japan, the Philippines, and to the cold war areas of the Far East, hence should be developed commercially in the interests of national defense.

We sincerely trust that you can prevail upon the President to retain this direct route from important industrial areas of the Midwest to the Orient.

RAY H. WEISBROD,
Executive Vice President,
Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

While the President has decided to eliminate the inland great circle route which leads from Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul, through Edmonton, Alberta, and Anchorage, Alaska, to the Orient, it is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Board is presently considering a separate application of the Northwest Airlines for authority to maintain service along the inland portion of that route. That particular portion stretches between Milwaukee and Anchorage, and the proposed route would terminate at that latter point instead of going on to the Orient.

It would appear to me that both proposals—the proposal for a limited route between Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and Anchorage, and the proposal for the much more extensive Orient route—warrant careful consideration. It is my hope that they will receive thorough study before the ultimate decision is reached, and that, in arriving at the final determination, the President and the CAB will carefully weigh the needs of Wisconsin, and of other Midwestern States, for adequate air transportation facilities.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MOLLOHAN. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1 would give the President full authority to negotiate trade agreements with other nations on the basis of reducing United States tariff restrictions. Many of us fear that this would lead to a reduction in our industrial capacity, the wiping out of many small industries and the unemployment of thousands of American workers through the resulting ruinous competition from cheap-labor-produced foreign imports.

The country is now being overwhelmed by propaganda favoring new tariff cuts, much of it inspired by the State Department. On January 8, 1955, Dr. George Gallup in a Public Opinion News Service release gives the result of a Gallup poll on this program. From this poll, Dr. Gallup draws the conclusion that the majority of the American people favor what the President proposes. This has been given wide circulation in the press, which, generally speaking, has a pro-free trade orientation.

Yet the figures from which Dr. Gallup draws this conclusion say exactly the opposite. Dr. Gallup's figures show that 42 percent of informed voters favor lower tariffs and that 26 percent prefer higher tariffs. But he completely fails to include in his own computation his own figure that 22 percent of informed voters favor maintaining tariffs at their present level. If those 22 percent are added to the 26 percent who favor higher tariffs, we find that 48 percent of informed voters are opposed to the principle expressed by H. R. 1, while only 42 percent support it.

Then, Dr. Gallup goes on to find that Republican voters favor lower tariffs 5 to 4.

The Public Opinion News Service of January 8, through which Dr. Gallup published his findings, begins with this headline: "Sentiment Favors Lowering Tariffs, Latest Poll Finds—Rank-and-File GOP Voters Who Would Change Present Policy Favor Lower Tariffs by 5 to 4." This headline was repeated by the press all over the Nation, much of which subscribes to this presumably objective service provided by Dr. Gallup.

But, by reading his own figures, we find that only 34 percent of informed Republicans favor lowering tariffs. On the other hand, 27 percent of informed Republicans favor the higher tariffs and 29 percent favor the tariffs we have now—or a total of 56 percent of informed Republicans would be against H. R. 1. Similarly, 43 percent of informed Democrats would be against H. R. 1 and 47 percent of informed Independents.

More details on this poll are set forth below.

While the phraseology of Dr. Gallup's questions is simple and objective, his findings by no means add up to anything resembling overwhelming national approval of lower tariffs. The following points seem significant:

First. The number of voters who are informed on the issue has increased materially since a similar poll was taken in February 1954.

Second. The number of informed voters who actually favor higher tariffs has also increased materially in the same period, from 16 percent to 26 percent. The number who favor lower tariffs has scarcely increased at all. The number who favor no change has decreased somewhat, and the number holding no opinion has decreased materially.

Third. There is no great difference in the percentage of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents who favor higher tariffs.

Fourth. It should be noted that the statement concerning a ratio of 5-to-4 favoring tariff reduction among rank-and-file Republicans can easily mislead the careless reader. This refers only to those Republicans who want to see a change in existing tariffs. It disregards the 22 percent who want no change and the 10 percent who hold no opinion. This whole finding could easily be restated with equal truth to read: "only 1 Republican in 3 and 1 Democrat in 2 actively favors lower tariffs."

Another way of putting it would be to say that "56 percent of Republicans and 43 percent of Democrats either want no change or want higher tariffs and are thus inferentially opposed to lower tariffs."

EXCESSIVE OIL IMPORTS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. 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. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House the serious problem created by excessive oil imports. My State of Oklahoma is largely dependent on the oil industry. Any adverse effect upon the oil industry in Oklahoma is immediately felt. The loss of State revenue required for essential State government activities is keenly felt. This is also reflected in the national picture. During recent years, oil imports have been increasing, taking more and more of the domestic market from producers. As a result, domestic oil producers have been repeatedly cut back.

Last week I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee urging that any extension of the Trade Agreements Act incorporate a provision that will eliminate the injury being suffered by the domestic oil industry because of ever-increasing oil imports.

I have introduced a bill which I believe offers a sound and reasonable method of solving this problem of excessive oil imports. My bill is based primarily upon the principle that we should encourage trade among nations to the fullest extent. But at the same time we should take steps to assure that the program does not endanger and destroy essential domestic defense industries. To further this principle, my bill provides that oil imports should not exceed 10 percent of domestic demand. My bill also includes a specific provision limiting residual fuel oil to 10 percent of the domestic demand for residual fuel oil, which is designed to give relief to another essential domestic industry; namely, the coal industry.

My proposal would not bar all imports. It would permit the continuation of healthy trade in oil. It is a reasonable and fair limitation. Last year all imports averaged 1,060,000 barrels daily. My bill would reduce imports to approximately 800,000 barrels daily. This would not destroy trade with our good neighbor Venezuela. It would permit Venezuela and other Western Hemisphere countries to continue imports at about current rates, if imports from the Middle East, which are most insecure from a defense viewpoint, were, through some unseen eventuality, eliminated. In addition, a 10-percent quota is justified on a historical basis. With the exception of the last 2 or 3 years, during the postwar period, imports have averaged about 10 percent of domestic demand. Prior to World War II, imports average about 5 percent. The 10-percent quota under my bill would permit a very healthy trade in oil. Far more than at anytime within the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned about the effects of excessive oil imports on the economy and welfare of my State. But of far greater importance to the Congress is the problem that is now facing the oil industry requiring the most careful attention of every Member of Congress. I believe that the bill that I have introduced provides a fair and effective solution. I urge every Member of the House to give this matter his immediate consideration.

THE SCHOOLS IN TROUBLE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, because of the current crisis facing our schools I am submitting the following material for your information.

By way of introduction, it seems appropriate to insert the following article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 3, 1955:

THE SCHOOLS IN TROUBLE

Everyone who has paid any attention to the condition of the public schools knows that they are in serious trouble. They are being called upon to do more and more. They do not have the resources—the money, the buildings, the facilities, the teachers—to do what they are expected to do.

There are, it is estimated, about 700,000 pupils who are being deprived of full-time schooling. There are not enough classrooms and not enough teachers. More than a million and a half children go to school in rented garages, churches, barracks, and other makeshift quarters. The number of pupils in one class that a teacher can teach effectively is generally put at a maximum of 30. Yet it is reliably estimated that there are more than this maximum number in at least half the classes in the country, and there are a large number with as many as 50 or 60 pupils per teacher.

The general picture is that of a Nation which has outgrown the capacity of its school system. This enormous growth and change, which has been very rapid in the past 30 years, raises formidable problems of how to educate adequately such a rapidly increasing number of children.

The whole educational community is engaged in a continuing reappraisal of its functions. Many of the problems of adapting education to the modern world are complex and controversial—particularly as they have to do with how to teach and with what to teach. Here there are differing views and one cannot generalize and be dogmatic. But there is a fundamental condition on which there can in fact be no dispute. It is that the American system of public education is now out of scale with the educational needs of the country. The money and the public effort which we are putting into the public school system are on the scale of an earlier age. They do not permit the school to keep pace with the growth of the population, with the change in the American ways of life, and with the new position of this country in the world.

The simplest way to visualize the overall problem of scale is to remember how we have changed our way of thinking about national defense and about public highways. Since the beginning, the country has always maintained Armed Forces. It has always built roads. But if we compare the military budget today with the budget on the eve of the Second World War, the difference in the amount is a difference not merely in degree but in kind. There has been a radical change in our whole conception of the scale of our national defense, and of its relation to whatever else the Nation does. We have gone through a smaller but a simpler change of attitude toward the public highways, having been compelled by the automobile to raise our effort to a scale of expenditures undreamed of in the horse and buggy days.

We have come into a time when we shall have to make a comparable change in our thinking about what we need to spend on education, what we believe we can afford to spend on education. At a very conservative estimate in the next 10 years we shall have to double the amount spent each year on the public schools. We shall have to go up from the $10 billion spent now to around $20 billion.

That is, as compared with the national defense, a modest amount of money. But it is still a large sum, and almost certainly it is too large if it has to be borne wholly or in the main by the States and localities. As we go into the matter closely there will be little doubt at the end of the argument that we have no choice as to how to finance the educational deficit. We shall have to turn to the Federal Government. For it alone has the capacity to raise the necessary revenues.

It goes without saying that we shall not solve our educational problems merely by spending more money. We shall not make the schools adequate only by putting up new buildings. We shall not solve the problem of the shortage of teachers only by offering more pay; we shall have also to give to the teaching profession the attractiveness and the dignity which in the American tradition it is supposed to have.

Though we cannot solve all the problems with more money, that is no excuse for failing to meet the gross, material, obvious deficiencies which can be cured and have to be cured with money. We shall never have the chance to solve the other and higher problems of our schools if we allow them to become more and more overcrowded, if we allow the teachers to become more and more overworked, if we allow the educational community to become more and more overwhelmed and discouraged.

The material and quantitative problems will have to be brought under control if we are to face lucidly and calmly and productively the problems of purpose and the problems of quality in the education of children for the modern age.

It would seem highly undesirable to encourage States and local communities to borrow unduly for the purposes of school construction. Of all the fields where future development should not be mortgaged to the payments of debts incurred during the past, the field of education stands in the forefront. As Walter Lippmann said in the above article:

We shall never have the chance to solve the other and higher problems of our schools if we allow them to become more and more overcrowded, if we allow the teachers to become more and more overworked, if we allow the educational community to become more and more overwhelmed and discouraged.

The future of our children is too important to the basic fiber of America to permit a continuation of the present lag in providing adequate school facilities.

We must not hamstring the potentialities of the future. That is why no approach should occupy our first attention but the grant-in-aid approach of Federal assistance. States and school districts have already made tremendous efforts to meet their school needs, and the figures presented herein graphically indicate that those efforts will continue. In applying Federal aid for school construction on a necessarily larger basis, it may be appropriate to consider an additional and supplemental form of aid by providing a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools. But this latter approach clearly does not help to meet the urgent school capital outlay requirements in the manner provided by Federal grants-in-aid.

There is no reason to believe that Federal contributions to State and local systems have been contrary to the public interest. Nobody can deny that adequate education for all who are educable, in this world of increasing complexity, is a crying need. That any substantial increases in Federal aid to education should continue to take the form of additional funds for construction, operation, and maintenance of public schools, payments in lieu of taxes, and for more and better science and technology should go without saying.

Perhaps the greatest weakness in the overall American public-school system is the insufficient salaries paid to teachers in every category. Being confronted with the overwhelming problem of school construction, States and local communities have slighted teachers' salaries. Indeed, to lessen the State and local burdens with respect to school construction, operation, and maintenance would be to leave State and local school authorities with more funds for salary payments.

To emphasize the tremendous problem faced by State and local school systems in providing and maintaining adequate school housing for the rapidly growing school population, I would like to refer to page 138 of the Report of the Statue Phase of the School Facilities Survey, published in December 1953 by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Covering the public elementary and secondary school facilities in 39 States, existing facilities were examined. Dollar need for new construction and rehabilitation were calculated. From the dollar-need totals in the various States were subtracted the amounts available in those States for new construction and rehabilitation of public-school buildings.

It was possible to present a rough comparison of the need in any State with the needs of the others by reducing to percentages the amounts lacked in the various States. Thus it was shown that 1 State lacked less than 10 percent of needed funds for capital outlay, 13 lacked more than 50 percent, and 6 more than 75 percent.

For Michigan the figures pointed out that 23.26 percent of the funds for needed capital outlay were absent. Minnesota lacked 27.83; Ohio lacked 20.50 percent; Illinois lacked 44.96 percent; Pennsylvania lacked 54.07 percent; California lacked 29.77 percent; Iowa, 38.62 percent; and Wisconsin, 40.41 percent. Thus, a strikingly high percentage of the so-called wealthy States are short of the necessary funds for school capital outlay requirements.

And these figures only begin to tell the story. Six States lack more than 75 percent of such funds needed; 13 States lack more than 50 percent. Add these difficulties to the increased birth rate and one can visualize the overwhelming impact that the problem of school construction, operation, and maintenance presents. Approximately 4 million new babies were added to the population during 1954. And all of this does not take into consideration population shifts.

In 1952 it was estimated that a shortage of 312,000 classrooms existed in the Nation. The term "shortage" includes both obsolescence and overcrowding. Obsolescent school buildings include those that are substandard. It is calculated that 2 percent of currently satisfactory classrooms become obsolescent each year. In 1952 there were 967,000 classrooms in the Nation. About 174,000 of them were obsolescent; and about 138,000 additional classrooms were needed because of overcrowding. Thus there was a critical need of 312,000 classrooms altogether. A continuing obsolescence of 2 percent of the classrooms means that between 16,000 and 20,000 are needed annually in the course of normal replacement.

The needed 312,000 classrooms to house 8,881,360 pupils as of 1952 would cost $10.6 billion. See Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey, December 1953, page 114, which shows a backlog of need as of 1952 of $10.6 billion, that of this amount, $5.9 billion could have been provided from applicable resources, leaving a deficit of $4.7 billion for all States.

There are no data on the question relative to what districts have to pay higher interest because their bonding capacity is limited or if bonds have been voted up nearly to bonding limits. This question is not fully applicable except in States having no- or only high-bond limits.

In attempting to present a fair picture of the difficulties that arise in meeting the classroom shortage, it should be pointed out that State reports show total debt but do not show bonded debt by school districts. Hence they do not give information on the number of districts that have exhausted all of their bonding capacity. One of the reasons the State totals do not reveal this picture is that local bonds are usually voted on local assessed valuations and surplus capacity in one district is not transferable to another district.

S. M. Brownell, Commissioner of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated in a release of August 29, 1954, that—

> Although our communities are building more schools than ever before in any single period of our Nation's history, the rate of construction will have to be nearly tripled if we are to keep pace with the number of children to be educated.

Today there is an estimated shortage of 350,000 classrooms. To accommodate the growing numbers of children, to erase the estimated current shortage of 350,000 classrooms, and to take care of continued obsolescence, more than 600,000 public elementary and secondary school classrooms and related facilities will be needed during the next 5 years. It is estimated that 50,000 classrooms were built in 1952–53; 55,000 in 1953–54; and 60,000 in 1954–55. These figures truly dramatize the dangerously increasing backlog facing the Nation. Considerably more than 100,000 classrooms will have to be built each year to overcome the present crisis.

It is not easy to cite an average cost of a classroom. In a publication of September 20, 1954, of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, School Housing Section, titled "Data on School Building Unit Costs and the Consumption of Critical Materials in the Public Elementary and Secondary School Buildings Erected During the Controlled Materials Program, 1951–52," the authors, N. E. Viles and Ray L. Hamon, show costs that average about $33,000 per classroom on a contract basis. If construction supervision, sites, and equipment, and so forth, are added, these costs probably would have averaged around $36,000 or $37,000 at that time. The cost covers classrooms and related facilities. Future costs are unpredictable.

Although data are not available to show the costs by regions of classrooms during the past 20 years, the following figures are indexes on building construction costs by the years mentioned. These are on the basis of one nationally known index. These indexes are rounded and are based on the 1913 base, that is, 1913 equals 100.

Year:	Index
1932	141
1934	167
1936	172
1938	199
1940	203
1942	222
1944	235
1946	262
1948	344
1949	352
1950	375
1951	400
1952	416
1953	431
1954	447
1955	453

The following table vividly illustrates the increase of expenditures for school capital outlay:

Expenditures for capital outlay and interest by public elementary and secondary school systems, biennially, 1931–32 to 1951–52

[Thousands of dollars]

School year	Capital outlay	Interest
1931–32	210,996	140,235
1933–34	59,277	137,036
1935–36	171,322	132,983
1937–38	238,853	114,102
1939–40	257,974	130,909
1941–42	137,552	108,781
1943–44	53,856	96,805
1945–46	111,046	76,923
1947–48	412,467	76,331
1949–50	1,014,176	100,578
1951–52 [1]	1,477,332	114,310

[1] $36,454,528.42 was paid to school districts for school construction pursuant to title II, Public Law 815 during fiscal year 1952. This may apply, however, to expenditures made by the school districts in several fiscal years.

Source: Statistics of State School Systems, Biennial Surveys of Education in the United States.

Compare the last figure given for 1952, $1,477,332,000, with the 1952 need of $10.6 billion, and we see that there is only about one-tenth of the necessary expenditure for classrooms. Today the figure of needed expenditure is probably closer to $15 billion.

The following table illustrates that the aggregate current expenditures from State and local sources for public elementary and secondary schools have been tripled during the past 20 years:

Non-Federal current expenditure for public elementary and secondary schools: United States, and Michigan

REVENUE INCOME FROM STATE AND LOCAL SOURCES

[Thousands of dollars]

Year	Continental United States	Michigan
1951–52	6,195,018	315,874
1949–50	5,281,075	265,435
1947–48	4,190,934	197,468
1945–46	3,018,213	137,655
1943–44	2,568,163	120,994
1941–42	2,382,028	102,962
1939–40	2,220,422	98,487
1937–38	2,196,049	97,058
1935–36	1,961,258	92,741
1933–34	1,788,732	73,131
1931–32	2,059,237	101,429

The following table indicates the overall expenditures for public elementary and secondary education. The existing expenditures are far short of the need.

Expenditures for public elementary and secondary education for 1951–52 (actual) and 1954–55 (estimated)

Expenditure	1951–52	1954–55 (estimated)
Current expenditures (including summer, adult, and evening schools)	$5,752,594,000	$7,070,000,000
Capital outlay	1,477,332,000	[1] 1,800,000,000
Interest	114,310,000	170,000,000
Total	7,344,236,000	9,040,000,000

[1] Tentative estimate, made in July 1954. This estimate should be regarded as minimal.

NOTE.—The figures in this table include expenditures from all sources (local, State, and Federal). The figures for current expenditures include expenditures for summer, evening, and adult schools, as well as regular day schools. Data for 1951-52 are taken from the forthcoming chapter II of the Biennial Survey of Education; the figures for 1954-55 represent estimates by the U. S. Office of Education.

The next table offers a projected figure relating to the aggregate non-Federal expenditure of State governments and school districts.

It should be observed that the estimated non-Federal current expenditure for 1951–52—$5,452,932,000—is not equal to the actual such expenditure for that year; namely, $6,195,018,000.

Estimated non-Federal current expenditure for public elementary and secondary day schools for continental United States, 1951–52 to 1959–60

Year	Estimated enrollment kindergarten to 12th grade (thousands)	Estimated average daily attendance kindergarten to 12th grade [1] (thousands)	Estimated non-Federal current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance [2]	Estimated non-Federal current expenditure (thousands)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5=col. 3×col. 4)
1951–52	[3] 26,563	[3] 23,257	[4] $234.46	[4] $5,452,932
1952–53	27,739	24,299	244.46	5,940,134
1953–54	29,183	25,564	254.46	6,505,015
1954–55	30,663	26,861	264.46	7,103,660
1955–56	32,026	28,055	274.46	7,699,975
1956–57	33,351	29,215	284.46	8,310,499
1957–58	34,679	30,379	294.46	8,945,400
1958–59	36,054	31,583	304.46	9,615,760
1959–60	37,363	32,730	314.46	10,292,276

[1] Percent of pupils enrolled attending daily equal 87.6 in 1951–52; assumed the same for subsequent years.

[2] 1951–52:

Current expenditure allocable to pupil costs	$5,680,643,000
Federal revenue	227,711,000
Estimated non-Federal current expenditure allocable	5,452,932,000
Average daily attendance	23,257,000
Estimated non-Federal expenditure per pupil	$234.46

$10 added to the $234.46 each year.

[3] Actual, not estimated.

[4] Comparable data for Michigan: Col. 4, $263.89; col. 5, $267,589,000.

Intergovernmental expenditure, by function and by State: 1952

State	Percent distribution of intergovernmental expenditure							
	All intergovernmental expenditure	Function not specified	Public Welfare: Categorical assistance programs	Public Welfare: Other	Education	Highways	Health and hospitals	All other
All States	100.0	10.9	16.5	2.8	50.1	14.4	2.5	2.8
Alabama	100.0	2.7	23.9	1.9	50.3	17.1	3.5	.5
Arizona	100.0	39.4	------	------	44.7	13.5	.3	2.1
Arkansas	100.0	12.0	------	------	69.9	15.4	2.0	.7
California	100.0	5.2	34.6	.4	41.9	9.7	1.7	6.5
Colorado	100.0	.4	63.0	2.9	15.3	15.9	1.2	1.2
Connecticut	100.0	16.5	------	14.7	59.9	7.6	.3	1.0
Delaware	100.0	------	4.6	2.5	88.5	2.3	------	2.1
Florida	100.0	4.7	------	------	72.2	17.9	1.3	3.9
Georgia	100.0	------	------	2.2	76.0	15.3	6.5	------
Idaho	100.0	11.5	------	------	47.5	39.1	1.7	.1
Illinois	100.0	------	------	15.1	53.7	28.3	2.0	.9
Indiana	100.0	2.4	20.1	.3	49.5	25.4	1.8	.4
Iowa	100.0	31.9	------	.1	29.1	37.1	1.4	.4
Kansas	100.0	11.7	31.3	5.5	30.4	13.3	1.0	6.8
Kentucky	100.0	1.2	------	------	82.9	3.1	5.1	7.7
Louisiana	100.0	23.5	------	------	61.2	6.5	1.4	7.4
Maine	100.0	3.3	------	4.9	59.1	31.9	.1	.6
Maryland	100.0	22.2	13.0	3.3	38.7	19.5	.9	2.4
Massachusetts	100.0	23.5	48.7	3.6	15.5	3.4	.4	4.9
Michigan	100.0	18.3	------	2.0	50.4	24.8	3.7	.8
Minnesota	100.0	7.1	30.8	1.2	48.1	10.2	1.5	1.0
Mississippi	100.0	14.8	------	------	53.6	23.3	7.1	1.2
Missouri	100.0	3.1	------	------	92.4	1.9	1.6	1.1
Montana	100.0	------	------	2.8	91.1	------	.9	5.2
Nebraska	100.0	1.0	45.4	3.6	17.3	30.3	1.4	0.9
Nevada	100.0	2.4	------	------	65.3	25.0	------	7.3
New Hampshire	100.0	59.1	------	------	34.1	3.5	------	3.3
New Jersey	100.0	1.4	19.4	3.3	39.6	23.9	6.6	5.9
New Mexico	100.0	1.7	------	------	90.6	4.6	1.6	1.5
New York	100.0	13.2	25.0	7.9	43.8	4.8	3.6	1.7
North Carolina	100.0	9.3	34.5	1.0	40.7	6.6	7.6	.3
North Dakota	100.0	2.7	------	1.1	59.9	34.1	------	2.2
Ohio	100.0	17.5	5.3	8.7	37.0	28.8	2.1	.6
Oklahoma	100.0	------	------	------	62.6	34.8	.6	2.0
Oregon	100.0	2.3	.2	1.5	63.8	31.3	.1	1.0
Pennsylvania	100.0	3.1	------	------	80.2	11.7	.2	4.8
Rhode Island	100.0	46.6	------	22.6	28.4	.7	1.6	------
South Carolina	100.0	11.6	------	------	73.1	8.7	5.8	.8
South Dakota	100.0	9.1	------	3.3	65.9	17.6	.3	3.8
Tennessee	100.0	10.8	------	------	68.9	16.6	3.2	.4
Texas	100.0	------	------	------	88.6	6.9	2.7	1.8
Utah	100.0	4.7	------	------	82.8	9.6	.9	1.9
Vermont	100.0	.2	------	.7	49.4	48.0	------	1.8
Virginia	100.0	13.3	12.4	2.1	63.6	4.9	1.2	2.5
Washington	100.0	7.5	------	1.8	63.9	17.1	5.2	4.5
West Virginia	100.0	------	------	3.0	95.3	------	.6	1.1
Wisconsin	100.0	40.1	20.0	.2	14.2	20.9	3.3	1.3
Wyoming	100.0	12.3	22.0	2.6	48.2	10.8	1.6	2.4

By far the largest segment of State payments tc local governments is for support of public schools. About 50 percent of all State intergovernmental expenditure in 1952 was for education, the amounts so provided being in excess of $2.5 billion. The term "State intergovernmental expenditure" is synonymous to the term "State payments to local governments." By definition, State intergovernmental expenditure involves the actual payment of money to local governments. It thus excludes State transactions or activities which benefit localities without involving flow of funds to local governments. In the publication, State Payments to Local Governments in 1952, State and Local Government Special Studies, No. 55, dated 1954, much valuable data was compiled by the Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce. The preceding table, showing the percentage of distribution of intergovernmental expenditure by function, is taken from that publication, page 73. Observe that around 50 percent of all intergovernmental expenditure goes for the purpose of education.

The most recent figures on the debt limits for the issuance of school bonds per State are shown below:

Limitations on the issuance of bonds for school capital outlay expressed as percents of taxable assessments, 1953–54

LESS THAN 6 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Illinois	5
Indiana	2
Iowa	[1] 5
Kentucky	2
Massachusetts	2.5–5

[1] Bonds in Iowa are subject to a further limitation of 7 mills for debt service.

Limitations on the issuance of bonds for school capital outlay expressed as percents of taxable assessments, 1953–54—Con.

LESS THAN 6 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS—Continued

State:	Percent
Montana	5
New Hampshire	5
Oklahoma	5
Rhode Island	3
South Dakota	5
Texas	5
Utah	3–4
Hawaii	5

6 TO 9 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Alabama	[2] 0
Georgia	7
Kansas	6–7
Maine	5–7.5
Maryland	[3] 0
New Jersey	4–8
New Mexico	6
North Carolina	5–8
Ohio	8
Oregon	3–9
Pennsylvania	7
South Carolina	8
West Virginia	8
Wisconsin	6
Wyoming	6

9 TO 12 PERCENT OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Arizona	10
Colorado	5–10
Connecticut	10
Delaware	5–10
Florida	10
Idaho	6–10
Missouri	10
New York	[4] 5–10
North Dakota	10
Tennessee	10
Vermont	[5] 10
Washington	10
Alaska	10

12 PERCENT OR MORE OF THE TAXABLE VALUATIONS

State:	Percent
Arkansas	15
California	5–15
Louisiana	20
Michigan	15
Minnesota	15–50
Mississippi	15
Nebraska	40
Nevada	10–13
Virginia	18

NOTE.—Alabama and Maryland are included in this table, although the debt limitations in these States are measured on different bases.

[2] Bonds may not be issued in an amount which would require more than 80 percent of the proceeds of the taxes pledged to debt service.

[3] No limit except that bond issues are approved by the State legislature which may also require a county referendum.

[4] Bonds above these limits must be approved by larger-than-majority votes.

[5] No limit for projects financed under the State School Construction Program.

In conclusion I would like to make some candid observations. It is true that obstacles to local and State progress often prevent a desirable rate of change, just as it is frequently true on the national scene. Perhaps more State equalization funds should be established. Perhaps a faster pace of redistricting could be achieved. But we all recognize, I am sure, that unprecedented efforts are being exerted by the States and local communities. We ought to know by now that nothing is accomplished by sacrificing the future of our children on the altar of our shortcomings. It will take all of our combined efforts—local, State, and Federal—to meet the current school crisis. I hope that this session of Congress will act swiftly in assuming its share of the common burden. My bill, H. R. 2357, is a long way toward achieving this.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time, the peope of my State, of the entire Northwest region and of those many States which make up the northern portion of our Nation from Oregon to the Middle West, have awaited with some anxiety, the action of one of the Government's important administrative agencies—the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is not necessary for me to call to your attention that this action, which is regarding renewal of certification for certain United States air routes in the Pacific, was called to public attention on February 1, 1955. The recommendations of the Board are by this time well known.

Among these recommendations, one particularly stands out as a monument to either sheer carelessness of decision or grandiose misapplication of reasoning. I refer directly to the Board's recommendation that Northwest Airlines not be renewed for certification in service to Hawaii, which it pioneered in 1948, which it has developed, promoted, and flown for the years between, and in which it established a most enviable record, a most satisfactory and convincing reputation.

But as startling as the Board's decision is to the people of the States and areas to which I have referred, even more startling is the statement of the Board which accompanied its decision—that its original, unanimous conclusions, though favoring renewal of this Northwest Airlines service, had been discarded by President Eisenhower and sent back to the Board and thence reissued in direct contradiction to the Board's first recommendation. In short, the unanimous approval of CAB, a nonpartisan administrative agency, reached after months of consideration, had overnight been reversed in hasty, ill-advised contemplation by the President.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this morning that a third rendering of opinion in this matter has occurred. We have heard, much to our continued bewilderment, that another version of the Government's policy has been rendered by President Eisenhower in respect to this Nation's civil air industry. We have heard and seen an amazing spectacle—an example of hasty decision after hasty decision. We have witnessed in a few short days a round robin of confusion in a matter which has much more than just regional significance, because it involves our entire civilian air transport industry.

There are those of my colleagues who would suggest that the final decision has been made—that both Northwest Airlines and Pan American World Airways will be allowed to fly competitively. And if such is the case, I am certain many of the people who have registered protest after protest over this affair will have been somewhat satisfied. But I emphasize this is a third decision on a single case in a matter of several days—and there are other cases yet to be decided; for example, the States-Alaska case, which involves the vital air link from Portland and Seattle to the Territory.

It is not my intention to direct criticism to anyone who is willing to reconsider a bad decision. As a matter of fact, I have urgently proposed reconsideration in this instance, as have many others in both the House and Senate. I seek only to make some fundamental points in this statement today—and they concern the manner in which recommendations of our administrative agencies have been held in disdain by the President. It is for this reason I am going to refer briefly to some of the important phases of this case.

Now, though they have been recorded in numerous publications and on numerous occasions these last several days, I feel impelled to make reference to some of the facts apparent in this case, for rarely have such overwhelmingly important facts either been totally overlooked or ignored. It is my hope that by repetition and by emphasis the shocking shallowness in the handling of this case will be seen in the light of indisputable, factual evidence.

Northwest Airlines has flown the Portland-Seattle-Hawaii flight successfully at low governmental cost. There exist ample statistics to support this beyond a shadow of doubt. Proof beyond statistical evidence in this fact exists in the offer made by Northwest that if allowed to continue its service, it would do so without subsidy. Further, it has reportedly asserted that it would willingly apply domestic rates to this Hawaiian extension of domestic routes leading from Chicago and points east through Portland and Seattle. Yet, the recommendation of CAB, in strict accordance with the President's instructions, certificated Pan American World Airways, out of San Francisco and Los Angeles, to fly the west coast-Hawaii route under subsidy. One cannot, by the greatest measure of imagination, construe that one service, functioning efficiently and providing highly satisfactory service to thousands of people without subsidy, should be thrown aside in favor of another service which functions under heavy subsidy, and even then, fails to provide the sort of service to which the greatest majority of users are accustomed.

In May of 1954, the Civil Air Policy, a report by the Air Coordinating Committee, by direction of the President, was made public. I would like to refer to a statement made by the President on May 26, 1954, and included as a preface to the printed version of the report, and then, I would like to quote directly from that report.

The following is quoted from the statement by the President:

I shall use this report as a guide in the future consideration of questions related to the subject of civil aviation and in making appropriate recommendations to Congress.

The following is quoted from the report:

In some cases—

Mainly in international operations—it may be necessary to continue subsidy for an indefinite period to preserve a service which is essential in the national interest, and which cannot be provided feasibly on a nonsubsidized basis. However, in each case, it must be carefully considered, not only whether the service itself is sufficiently essential to justify indefinite Federal support, but also whether the service can be rendered by other United States carriers with less or no subsidy. * * * We believe that reduction of subsidy assistance at this time will provide the most effective stimulus for the type of industry adjustments and operating economies which are needed to strengthen the air transport system.

Is it surprising, then, to any of us, that the people of my State and most every other State are bewildered by a policy which aims intentions in one direction and acts in direct opposition to its aims? Is it not startling and is it not bewildering and is it not frightening to realize that decisions affecting the people of not just my State, but of many States, can be and seemingly are made with disregard for carefully mapped policy and with disdain for recommendations painstakingly reached and honestly rendered—as was the CAB original recommendation in the West Coast-Hawaii case?

Another fact apparent in the Board's reconstructed decision was seen in the monopolistic condition which surrounded the service as provided by Pan American World Airways. Certainly the monopoly which would have fallen to Pan American by this decision is not justifiable. It is not pleasant to reflect on the implications. It is distasteful to suggest that monopoly is not being prevented by our Government. It is shocking to consider that monopoly is supported with subsidy by our Government. Yet, this is what happened. And what happened could have been tragic.

True, Mr. Eisenhower's decision granting monopoly was reversed by Mr. Eisenhower. Nevertheless, we must not be misled. It is all too obvious that tragedy occurs also in the policy which permits—and again, I use the phrase—the aiming of intention in one direction and the actual acting in direct opposition to the aim.

I quote from the President's Economic Report of January 20, 1955:

Government should persist in its efforts to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly and to preserve a competitive environment.

The direction of the initial action is clear. Mr. Eisenhower's first decision accords to Pan American World Airways: First, a monopoly; and, second, a noncompetitive environment.

The initial shock of this affair first settled like a shroud on many people in the Northwest. But now the shock is over, now the anger has become evident and like every other delegate from my State I have been flooded with wired and written paragraphs of protest. I shall not add these to the many already a matter of record.

In compliance with my own convictions and the desires of the people of my State I joined with the two Senators from Oregon in urging the President's reconsideration. Others of my colleagues were similarly impelled.

We have let the President know how we feel—and in no uncertain terms. And we are grateful that he has responded to act favoring Northwest Airlines' flight to Hawaii.

And so we await other decisions in other instances such as the States-Alaska case, which will determine the future of air service to Alaska from the great Northwest. We await the occasion of action which again may very well fall hastily and in discord with the President's so-called policy. We wait to learn whether Alaskans face a blow to their economy, whether they will be allowed the opportunity of a competitive market, whether they will necessarily pay for the conception of a monopoly.

And we pause to ponder the implications of a once-rendered, ill-advised and thoughtlessly made decision based illogically on what readily appears to be a reward to monopoly and a tribute to pressure.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of our colleague from Oregon just shows what a great President we have. In spite of all of the misinformation that he gets and of the erroneous advice which is given him and urged on him, attempts to pressurize him, probably, and sometimes, evidently in this place successfully, when the facts come to his knowledge he makes the right decision. I hope that our Democratic friends will not blame him if sometimes, when they go down to a Presidential reception, the food happens to be scorched or the wine is not quite to their taste.

PROTESTS TEXTILE TARIFF REDUCTION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago a man who represents the wool growers and manufacturers and workers in the woolen industry protested bitterly by long-distance telephone the suggested reduction in tariff rates. I know, Mr. Speaker, if the reduction proposed in textiles is pursued, it will mean almost complete annihilation of both the woolen and textile industries.

We cannot in this country compete with the labor of Japan, and India and Italy in velveteen and corduroys.

I hope the entire House will rise in revolt against this tremendous injustice to our textile institute all over the United States.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

MEDFORD, MASS., *December 19, 1954.*

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Lowell, Mass.:

Much interested your published Boston Globe interview with the President regarding textile situation. If every woolgrower received 30 cents per pound from the Government as subsidy, the cost would be less than one-third the price paid for one battleship. This country is being flooded with cheap foreign goods while our manufacturers who are supposed to hire American labor cannot secure orders for American yardage of cloth. Raise the tariff $2 per yard on imported goods before it is too late and put wool on the free list paying subsidy to woolgrowers. The taxes paid by successful manufacturers will more than pay the subsidy and in addition American labor will be employed instead of going on welfare lists and unemployment rolls for taxpayers to finance. How much longer do you think the country can stand this nonsense? Regards and more power to you.

KENNETH HUTCHINS.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES CASE

Mr. JUDD. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some comments have just been made about the Northwest Airlines case and the suggestion was left that there was something improper in what the President did in overruling the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board and granting to Pan American Airlines the route from Seattle and Portland to Honolulu.

For the purpose of the full record perhaps the House ought to be reminded that in July 1948 the Civil Aeronautics Board recommended and the then President approved that this route to Honolulu be given to Northwest Airlines and denied to Pan American. Two months later, in September 1948, the same President of the United States without public explanation, so far as I can recall, reversed himself, overruled the CAB and cut Pan American in on the route. I have not heard any Democrats insinuating that the then President was being influenced by big interests.

When President Eisenhower recently renewed the route to Pan American and denied it to Northwest, he said it was because of the laws written by this Congress directed him to reduce subsidies. Facts submitted by the examiner indicated Northwest required twice as big a subsidy as Pan American to break even. But this case has been pending for many

months and when it was demonstrated to him that the subsidy situation has changed recently so that it is expected both lines will be subsidy free by next fiscal year, he had the courage publicly to change his position and modify the decision so both lines will continue to operate the route as at present, for 3 more years.

The President was not bowing to public protests, as the papers have said. He was acting on the basis of the more current facts. I admire a man who will do that and am glad the country now has such a man as its President.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House on behalf of the President's program to provide assistance to increase school construction across the country. These proposals are another example of the constructive conservatism of the Eisenhower administration. They deserve the earnest consideration of the Congress. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I am happy today to introduce a bill authorizing his recommendations. I trust that early hearings by our committee will be in order.

This bill lays the framework for positive and constructive steps to meet our national needs for additional schoolroom facilities. I should like to emphasize that the program outlined in the bill is specifically designed to keep the responsibility for American education at home, in the local school district where it belongs. It is designed also to elicit the greatest possible use of State and local resources without transferring the responsibility from the States to the Federal Government with the consequent threat of centralized control.

The program recognizes the great diversity of conditions affecting our 63,000 school districts in 48 States and provides alternative solutions to meet their differing problems. We must face the fact that no single or simple remedy will solve the varying problems of our communities across the country.

The program outlined in the bill seeks to facilitate immediate State and local action to meet effectively our national needs, within the framework of the traditional responsibility of local communities and the States for the education of our children. To this end, the Federal Government proposes to assist the States and communities in a working partnership to build the needed facilities. This effort seeks to widen customary channels of financing and materially expand the flow of capital for construction of facilities.

Several points deserve emphasis. I should like to make clear to my colleagues that the enactment of this bill, first of all, would make possible a tremendous volume of new construction. Over the next 3 years this bill makes possible the joining of local, State, and Federal resources amounting to $7 billion which would result in approximately 200,000 new classrooms to house nearly 6 million children. Secondly, it should be made clear that this bill will permit the building of schools as fast as any alternative program now under consideration. Thirdly, it is completely voluntary in its provisions. In the fourth place, it is comprehensive and is designed to meet the varying needs of our varied school districts and their problems. Finally, it fully preserves local initiative and local responsibility.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWIN YATES WEBB

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has become my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a distinguished North Carolinian and former Member of this body, the Honorable Edwin Yates Webb, of Shelby, N. C. Judge Webb died Monday morning, February 7, 1955, at Wilmington, N. C., while on a short vacation.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Webb was a predecessor of mine and one of my most honored constituents. He was born of a pioneer family on May 23, 1872, in Shelby, N. C., and resided there all of his life. Educated at the Shelby Military Institute, Wake Forest College, the University of North Carolina, and the Law School of the University of Virginia, he was well equipped to serve the people of North Carolina for more than half a century. Judge Webb was elected and served with honor in the North Carolina State Senate during the 1901 session. Dedicated to the principles of the Democratic Party, he served as chairman of the Cleveland County Democratic Executive Committee from 1898 to 1902, and as temporary chairman of the Democratic State Convention in 1900.

His qualities of leadership, character and ability were soon recognized on a wider scale and the people of the old Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina selected Judge Webb to serve in the 58th Congress and 8 succeeding Congresses. While a Member of the Congress, he distinguished himself by his successful sponsoring of legislation prohibiting the sale and use of intoxicating beverages and served as chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary. In recognition of his legal and judicial ability, President Woodrow Wilson selected him for appointment as district judge of the United States Court for the Western District of North Carolina. Judge Webb served in this capacity with great honor and distinction for almost 30 years until his retirement on March 1, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent times our Nation can ill afford to lose men of the character and high purpose of Judge Webb. He was devoted to the highest ideals of public service and his entire record of such public service stands today without a single blemish. He was a man of sterling character, unquestioned integrity, fierce patriotism and undying devotion to country and family. His great understanding of human nature enabled him to serve his people well and to administer justice from the Federal bench with a noble purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the foundation upon which rested the character, life, and service of this great man was his dedication to church and God. For above all else Judge Webb was a Christian gentleman of the highest order. He followed the Christian principles in the home, in the Congress and on the bench. North Carolina and the Nation have lost a great and noble man. He will soon be laid to rest on the rolling hills of Cleveland County alongside of Governor and Ambassador, O. Max Gardner, and Governor and Senator, Clyde R. Hoey. These three sons of Cleveland County have left their marks on county, State, and Nation which time will not soon erase.

To Judge Webb's widow and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their loss.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to pay tribute to a great man, Hon. E. Yates Webb, of Shelby, N. C., who recently died within the boundaries of his beloved State. He was a former Member of this body and judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. His passing has saddened the hearts of all who knew him.

During his life he came in contact with many people. His outstanding character, wise counsel, and absolute impartiality set a pattern for all to follow. His influence for good will be lasting.

His was an outstanding career of service to the people of his judicial district and to the State and Nation he loved so well. Blessed with a great spirit of warmth, coupled with complete sincerity of purpose, he vigorously championed the principles in which he believed. We will sorely miss Judge Webb but his many good works will long be remembered.

To his widow, children, and other members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the people of North Carolina, and the Nation generally, were saddened when it was announced that Judge Edwin Yates Webb, of Shelby, N. C., had passed away.

Judge Webb was a most distinguished jurist, a statesman, and a beloved and respected citizen. He was born in Shelby, Cleveland County, N. C., was a graduate from Wake Forest College, and studied law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Virginia, Charlottsville. He was a member of the State Senate of North Carolina in 1901 and a Member of the United States House of Representatives from 1903 to 1919 when he resigned to accept a judicial position. He served a long and useful term as United States district judge for the Western District of North Carolina, from which he retired in March 1948. His contributions to the State of North Carolina and to the Nation have been outstanding and his accomplishments and many years of service will long be an inspiration to everyone to follow. His life is a worthy example many should do well to pattern after.

To his family I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. All of us here will miss him, but our grateful remembrance of Judge Webb shall remain forever constant.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon in paying brief tribute to the memory of Judge E. Y. Webb. I have known Judge Webb all my life and reside only about 20 miles from the city in which he lived all of his life. My father was a contemporary of Judge Webb and, although they were not of the same political persuasion, they were close personal friends all down through the years. My father ran for Congress against Judge Webb and they engaged in a heated political campaign, but that did not mar the regard each held for the other.

My father introduced me to Judge Webb soon after I became licensed to practice law and I had the opportunity to appear frequently in the court over which he presided. He was a profound legal student and had the ability to go right to the heart of any problem before him. He was a wise judge who understood human nature and he administered justice with mercy.

I once served as assistant United States attorney in the court over which Judge Webb presided and frequently found myself in his court in the trial of civil and criminal cases. I found him to be uniformly courteous and considerate to litigant and counsel. And then when court was in recess, lawyers and court officials would gather around his chair in the hotel lobby and listen to him discuss the important questions of the day.

Before Judge Webb was a judge, he served in Congress the district I now have the honor to represent here. This was before our district was divided a few years ago and the county in which he lived is now in the 11th Congressional District, so ably represented now by our colleague, Congressman JONES. Judge Webb had a long and distinguished career here in Congress. I have been pleased to learn that his ability was so pronounced and his devotion to duty so outstanding that he is still remembered by some of the older Members of Congress even though it has been more than 30 years since he served here in the House. He retired voluntarily in order to continue his public service on the bench.

I considered Judge Webb a warm personal friend. He has extended many favors to me in the past and I learned with profound sorrow of his sudden passing. I join my colleagues here today in extending Mrs. Webb and to his children my deep sympathy in this hour of their bereavement.

North Carolina has lost one of her great men in his passing. I predict that he will long be remembered by people in all walks of life throughout our State for the faithful and devoted service he rendered throughout his long and distinguished career.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, today our President sent his message to this House urging Federal aid to education, and particularly stressing the need for school construction. Anticipating that request, and also that there undoubtedly will be legislation upon that subject, I have introduced today a bill which I think becomes peculiarly applicable in view of the fact that we will probably entertain legislation along the lines of the President's recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced reads as follows:

A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems

Be it enacted, etc., That the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States courts of appeals, the United States district courts, and all other Federal judicial tribunals, quasi-judicial tribunals, and all administrative or executive agencies, shall have no jurisdiction to decide or consider, either originally, on appeal, or by other means of review, any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems.

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed or modified to the extent of such inconsistency.

If passed, this bill will restore to the respective States the administration of their educational systems. The passage of this bill would be the complete answer to the threat or fact, as the case may be, that the Federal Government is regimenting, or trying to regiment, education. It appears to many in this body, and, indeed, to the public generally, that the Federal Government is presently trying to dominate the field of education. If this is not true, the claimed power by some in the field of education that the Government should control education on a national level remains a serious threat, and can mean that this claimed power may be asserted in the future, if possible.

I know no Member of this body who does not say that they are against the Federal Government exercising power over our school systems, and who does not admit it would be disastrous if such should happen. This bill will prevent that danger, and I hope it will receive the overwhelming support of this 84th Congress.

There is nothing new or novel in this legislation proposed by me. The power to pass this legislation is found in article 3, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States, dealing with the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the pertinent part reading as follows:

In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

In other words, the Congress has the constitutional authority and the duty to make such exceptions and regulations as it deems proper regarding the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Consequently, the responsibility for making proper exceptions and regulations rests upon the Congress exclusively. This authority and duty imposed upon Congress has been recognized many times by the United States Supreme Court. See *Durosseau* v. *U. S.* (6 Cranch 307, 313), *Barry* v. *Mercein* (5 How. 103, 119), *U. S.* v. *Young* (94 U. S. 258, 259), *Ex parte McCardle* (7 Wall, 506). The principle enunciated in the McCardle case has been affirmed so many times that it is firmly entrenched in our legal jurisprudence.

That Congress can likewise regulate the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts and Federal agencies is a power apparently without dispute. See *Turner* v. *Bank of North America* (4 Dall 8), *U. S.* v. *Hudson and Goodwin* (7 Cr. 32), *Cary* v. *Curtis* (3 How. 236). See United States Code Annotated Constitution, article 1, section 10 to article 10 for citation of authorities too numerous to specifically refer to.

The present administration says it wants to aid the States in the field of education without dominating, regimenting, or impairing the State school systems. The motive inspiring me to introduce this bill is to make it safe for the Federal Government to assist education as the need may arise—aid which the States cannot furnish for themselves—without fear upon the part of the Congress, or the States, that the power of the States to control the administration of their educational systems will be destroyed or abridged.

I invite every Member of Congress to join with me in the passage of this bill. I will greatly appreciate every Member of this body who approves this legislation, advising me that they will assist in making this needed legislation the law of our land.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TUCK). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the present session of Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 82, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this resolution before, and before my time it was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, the late Mr. Robsion, who was, I believe, the original sponsor.

I am happy to say that this year we have a list of 156 sponsors, to date, which is considerably more than we had last year when we had only 105.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the list may be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The same arguments and dire predictions that were made in the battle for women's suffrage are being trotted out once again, and they are hardly even being dusted off for modern consumption. We are told that all the protective legislation for women will be instantly wiped off the statute books when and if this amendment becomes law.

Let us look at this terrifying amendment and see what it says. Here it is, and I quote:

> Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
>
> SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.
>
> SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect one year after the date of ratification.

What is taken away by these words? Absolutely nothing, of course. All it does is to bring the Constitution up to date by adding the word "sex" to the original "race, creed, or color" that appear elsewhere in our much vaunted laws against discrimination.

Now, someone will say, Why do we need the amendment? Because the Constitution's provisions are framed in the language of the English common law and under that common law, which as we all know, is very, very ancient, women had no citizens' rights whatsoever.

The 14th and 15th amendments give equal protection and political rights to all persons—citizens—regardless of race. Yet the effect of court decisions has been to except women in certain of their applications.

The 19th amendment, in 1920 gave women the right to vote, but did not alleviate the legal results of the denial of their other citizens' rights and responsibilities.

Laws throughout the States prohibit women from engaging in business without court or husband's consent, grant the father preference in children's guardianship, provide different bases for divorce, discriminate against widows, capriciously protect some working women, relegate women to inferior role, despite the responsibilities they must assume in a modern world.

In the absence of a constitutional amendment, what the State legislature gives this year, it can take away next year.

Jury service is still denied women in 5 States and there are separate provisions for qualifying women jurors in 20 States.

Court sanction and in some cases the husband's written consent are necessary before a wife may go into independent business in five States.

Married women are treated unequally in all community-property States. While provisions vary, in general: The husband may will one-half of the property, the wife may not; management and control of property are vested in the husband; husband but not wife may contract against it; husband may spend or dispose of community property while wife has no redress.

A husband is owner of his wife's earnings in both North and South Dakota.

Widows' rights are inferior to widowers' in many States, including that of title to real estate, personal property, and right to will property.

Restrictive work laws for women only—minimum hours, wages, and conditions of work applying to women only serve to make employment of women a matter of additional reports to employers. Hence in times of depressed employment this serves as a hardship to women workers.

The amendment will preserve States' rights—States may still legislate under their police power on health, welfare, civil matters—only proviso is that laws shall apply to citizens without regard to sex.

This amendment has been adopted and sponsored by many organizations, among others the General Federation of Women's Clubs; National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; National Association of Women Lawyers; National Education Association of the United States; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc; and National Woman's Party.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor of history, Harvard University:

> Many well-meaning persons have opposed the equal rights amendment on the ground that it would deprive women of special statutory protection in industry. In recent years, however, legislation has extended to men wage earners most of the advantages earlier granted exclusively to women. Hence no substantial objection of a practical character remains for treating the two groups of workers differently, whereas the principles of democracy require that they should be treated alike. For these as well as for other reasons, I favor the proposed amendment.

There is a much deeper reason for the activity against the amendment than the reasons given by its opponents today. Their crocodile tears over the rights they do not want women to lose are an absurdity anyway. How can granting equal rights take away any rights under the law? There are many men today who fear the competition of women in the labor market. They smilingly tell you that they are strongly against equal rights but wholeheartedly for equal pay for equal work. This is like saying you can walk in the rain bareheaded and not get wet. Women will never obtain equal pay for equal work until they are equal citizens under the Constitution. It is therefore excellent strategy to prevent the passage of the amendment by Congress and its submission to the States for ratification, as the front behind which equal pay for equal work remains a pious hope and nothing more.

Why should equal rights take away any special rights necessary for women, any more than they are taken from veterans, members of the Armed Forces, the blind, the indigent, the sick, the insane, and numerous other citizens, men, women, and children, for whom special legislation has been passed and will continue to be passed, whenever it is found necessary to do so?

Both sexes should, in the modern world, have equal rights under the Constitution, no more, no less. That equality will in no way affect special legislation needed for special cases, any more than equality in the past has affected the laws pertaining to the many various groups of citizens that have been mentioned earlier.

The amendment has been veiled by its opponents with a lot of legalistic knots and tangles that terrify the average laymen, men or women. This, of course, is the intention. We in this country are beginning to suffer, not only from too much law but from too many lawyers. Many great civilizations of the past suffered from this same disease. In the end they became so rigid and inflexible that progress was impossible and their decay and fall were merely a question of time.

The protagonists of this amendment have no power to have it enacted into law. All they ask is the right to have this simple amendment submitted to the people. If they do not want it, let them say so. Up to now they have been prevented from expressing any opinion.

We are weary of hearing those who do not want women to obtain their rights in the labor market of this Nation disguise their unpopular stand under the protests of protecting women and fighting to save these few protecting laws, which would in no wise be affected.

This amendment means just what it says, in spite of all the lawyers and their clever interpretations. It gives women equality under the Constitution. It takes nothing away, but it will make possible and probable equal pay for equal work and equality of opportunity for all our citizens regardless of sex.

If this amendment will be harmful to women, let them express that opinion by their votes. Give them the opportunity to do so. Obviously the opponents of the measure dare not do this. They do not feel their cause is very strong and

they prefer to smother the baby in the cradle rather than let it grow up and go out into the world and fight its way to victory.

But, just as woman's suffrage was slow and hard to come by, so the equal-rights amendment will be. Just as woman's suffrage was another inevitable step forward on the road of progress, so this amendment will be another such step. It will come, maybe not in the next session of the Congress, maybe not for several. But it will come, because you cannot stop the waves of progress in the United States any more than King Canute could stop the waves of the sea.

SPONSORS OF THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

(Sponsors now number 156; in the last Congress there were 105 sponsors)

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN; CARL ELLIOTT; GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

Arizona: STEWART UDALL.

Arkansas: WILBUR D. MILLS, OREN HARRIS, W. F. NORRELL.

California: HUBERT B. SCUDDER; JOHN E. MOSS, JR.; JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER; CHARLES S. GUBSER; B. F. SISK; HARLAN HAGEN; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH; DONALD L. JACKSON; CARL HINSHAW; JAMES ROOSEVELT; HARRY R. SHEPPARD; JOHN PHILLIPS; ROBERT C. WILSON; GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB.

Colorado: BYRON G. ROGERS, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Connecticut: THOMAS J. DODD, ALBERT P. MORANO, JAMES T. PATTERSON.

Delaware: HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.

Florida: WILLIAM C. CRAMER; A. S. HERLONG, JR.; BOB SIKES; D. R. MATTHEWS; DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

Idaho: GRACIE PFOST.

Illinois: RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LESLIE C. ARENDS, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, CHARLES A. BOYLE.

Indiana: E. ROSS ADAIR, WILLIAM G. BRAY, EARL WILSON, JOHN V. BEAMER, CECIL M. HARDEN.

Iowa: FRED SCHWENGEL, HENRY O. TALLE, H. R. GROSS, PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Kansas: WILLIAM H. AVERY, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, WINT SMITH.

Kentucky: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, BRENT SPENCE, CARL D. PERKINS, EUGENE SILER.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OTTO E. PASSMAN.

Maine: CHARLES P. NELSON.

Maryland: EDWARD T. MILLER, JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, GEORGE H. FALLON, RICHARD E. LANKFORD, DEWITT S. HYDE, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Massachusetts: EDWARD P. BOLAND, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, DONALD W. NICHOLSON.

Michigan: GERALD R. FORD, JR., DON HAYWORTH, ALVIN M. BENTLEY, RUTH THOMPSON, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.

Minnesota: EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, COYA KNUTSON.

Missouri: GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, W. R. HULL, JR., MORGAN M. MOULDER.

Montana: ORVIN B. FJARE.

Nebraska: ROBERT D. HARRISON, A. L. MILLER.

Nevada: CLIFTON YOUNG.

New Jersey: WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

New York: FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.; STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT; ALBERT H. BOSCH; LESTER HOLTZMAN; VICTOR L. ANFUSO; ABRAHAM J. MULTER; IRWIN D. DAVIDSON; HERBERT ZELENKO; J. ERNEST WHARTON; LEO W. O'BRIEN; DEAN P. TAYLOR; BERNARD W. KEARNEY; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS; WILLIAM E. MILLER; EDMUND P. RADWAN; JOHN R. PILLION; DANIEL A. REED; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG; RALPH W. GWINN.

North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK.

Ohio: GORDON H. SCHERER, THOMAS A. JENKINS, WILLIAM H. AYRES, FRANK T. BOW, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, WAYNE L. HAYS, JAMES G. POLK.

Oklahoma: PAGE BELCHER, TOM STEED, VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Pennsylvania: WILLIAM A. BARRETT, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, EARL CHUDOFF, IVOR D. FENTON, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, FRANK M. CLARK, JAMES G. FULTON, JAMES M. QUIGLEY, BENJAMIN F. JAMES, CARROLL D. KEARNS, JOHN P. SAYLOR, JOSEPH L. CARRIGG.

South Dakota: HAROLD O. LOVRE, E. Y. BERRY.

Tennessee: JOE L. EVINS, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Texas: BRADY GENTRY, BRUCE ALGER, OLIN E. TEAGUE, FRANK IKARD.

Utah: HENRY ALDOUS DIXON.

Vermont: WINSTON L. PROUTY.

Virginia: HOWARD W. SMITH, PAT JENNINGS, JOEL T. BROYHILL.

Washington: JACK WESTLAND, RUSSELL V. MACK, WALT HORAN, THOR C. TOLLEFSON.

West Virginia: ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, M. G. BURNSIDE.

Wisconsin: GARDNER R. WITHROW, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT.

Wyoming: E. KEITH THOMSON.

Hawaii: Mrs. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ASHMORE (at the request of Mr. FLYNT) asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 17, after the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TRANSOCEAN AIRLINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I had occasion to address this House on the subject Transocean Airlines, an international airline whose principal operating base is in my district and whose welfare is of vital importance to the economy of that area. This company and its subsidiaries employ approximately 2,500 people, with an annual payroll in excess of $10 million.

On February 1 the President accepted a recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board which denied Transocean's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to perform air services in the Pacific between California and the Orient. I sincerely believe that the Board was in error in denying Transocean's application and that the President should reverse this position.

For 9 years this company has been pioneering new and novel ideas in the field of air transportation. Starting as a contract carrier to the Military Air Transport Service, it very quickly moved into the field of mass transportation of laborers to the Pacific area, then in the process of being rebuilt, and into the movement of immigrants from the ravaged areas of Europe to Canada and to South America. In these years it has supplied the know-how of American aviation to the Philippine Islands through the Philippine Air Lines; to Japan through the Japan Air Lines; to the Middle East through Air Jordan and Iranian Airways; to Indonesia through training air cadets for the New Indonesian Air Force, and is participating in the training of one of the world's newest airlines, the Lufthansa of Germany.

During these years it has contributed to our military efforts principally in the Berlin airlift and in the Korean airlift. Transocean supplied almost 11 percent of the commercial lift between the United States and Japan during the Korean conflict.

The Transocean payroll is absolutely essential to the economy of the San Francisco Bay area.

If the company is forced to abandon its operations the labor market will be glutted with the high-type skilled mechanics that constitute the major portion of its labor force.

The Transocean pool of highly qualified and well-coordinated mechanics, skilled in airplane construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation, is a valuable and indispensable asset in our defense effort. Can we afford to see it dissolved and vanish into thin air?

Some 30 months ago Transocean applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate to engage in scheduled operations in the Pacific Basin to give low-cost nonsubsidized service from the west coast to Hawaii, Guam, and various points in the Orient. It is important to note that the application specifically stated that no subsidy would be requested. Civil organizations, service clubs, chambers of commerce, and so forth, in my district and in surrounding areas, were unanimous in the support of this request for certification. Nonetheless, the Civil Aeronautics Board saw fit to deny this application.

If Transocean is to continue to live, it is necessary that it have a stable future and it must live for many reasons, only one of which is that if there arose a military need for commercial air services the company would be equipped and trained and ready to be of service.

I felt that every logic pointed to certification of this company. Without this, the people of my district employed by Transocean will be deprived of the economic stability that is necessary to their present and future welfare. Furthermore, the people of this country will be denied the benefits of competition on one of the principal air routes of the world.

The very foundation of our great democracy is based on the principles of free enterprise and vigorous new ideas. This carrier's record is an outstanding example of self-sufficiency, proven fitness, and ability. The development of a strong United States air-transportation system linking the United States with Asia demands a carrier with these qualifications.

Further, it is most important that a company experienced in logistic support at this critical time in the history of our country be recognized as a certificated carrier of the United States.

On Friday, February 4, 1955, the Oakland Tribune, published by the Honorable Joseph R. Knowland, carried the following editorial:

AN UNFAIR DECISION

The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to refuse Transocean Air Lines a

certificate for regular scheduled service across the Pacific is difficult to understand and is to be regretted.

This is particularly so when it is remembered that Transocean offered to carry out a scheduled service under an operational program that would have waived all Government subsidies, something entirely new in international air traffic.

Transocean, which has headquarters in Oakland, is one of Alameda County's biggest industries with a correspondingly large payroll. It will not go out of business, as it can operate on an unscheduled and charter basis under a letter of authority issued by the CAB, but expansions it has planned, if the request for a certificate for scheduled flights had been granted, will be held in abeyance.

The decision of the CAB is final as far as the routine procedure in such matters is concerned. But Transocean and its supporters in this area propose to carry the fight to Congress and even to the White House, although technically it was an order from President Eisenhower to the CAB which made the refusal an effective order.

The decision deprives Oakland of the honor of being the terminus of a scheduled international line. Transocean and those who plan to continue the campaign should be accorded all the additional support that can be registered.

The Washington Post and Times Herald on Saturday, February 5, 1955, also touched on the subject in its editorial columns:

RIZLEY TO THE CAB

Apparently President Eisenhower has at last found a nominee for the Civil Aeronautics Board who can satisfy all the requisite clearances. Let us hope that the nomination of Ross Rizley (who presumably will be designated CAB Chairman) will bring some order out of the confusion in which the Board has been left since the first of the year. Mr. Rizley, a former Republican Member of Congress from Oklahoma and more recently an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, is a man of wide acquaintance and very conservative political views. He gained prominence several years ago because of his energetic efforts to prohibit Federal regulation of natural-gas producers; later he worked effectively on Capitol Hill to gain support for the flexible farm program. Incidentally, he will become the second Oklahoman currently on the CAB. The other is Josh Lee, a Democrat whose term expires this year.

Mr. Rizley will be the fourth former Member of Congress on a five-man board. It is perhaps regrettable in this connection that the CAB vacancy was viewed as a political roost rather than as a spot for a man skilled in regulation and aviation economics. In any event, Mr. Rizley will need to demonstrate his independence and his ability to withstand pressures. Few jobs in Washington are so subjected to lobbying influence. The White House itself apparently yielded to such pressures when—following the unceremonious dumping of a Republican CAB member with 16 years' service, Oswald Ryan—it abandoned its first candidate to succeed him after opposition developed.

Almost simultaneously with the Rizley appointment, President Eisenhower again overruled the CAB in an international route decision, this time in the so-called transpacific case. Although this newspaper dislikes to see the recommendations of regulatory commissions upset, except for compelling reasons, it is hard to quarrel with the President's decision that the renewal of Pan American and Northwest Airlines routes across the Pacific ought to be on a temporary basis so long as both carriers require subsidy. More controversial is the President's refusal to renew Northwest's Seattle-Honolulu route, thus leaving Pan Am to serve this particular segment alone even though Northwest reportedly had offered to forego subsidy on the route. Evidently the President is saying that Northwest ought to concentrate on its northern route to Japan and that competition in the Pacific ought to be on an area rather than a parallel basis.

On one point we regret that neither the CAB nor the President saw fit to adopt the examiner's recommendation. That was in the request of Transocean Airlines for some sort of permanent status as an irregular carrier across the Pacific. Transocean is one of the most reputable and responsible of the nonscheduled carriers; it has transported military passengers and cargo without subsidy and with scrupulous regard for regulations. If the CAB ever intends to do something about the anomalous situation of the nonskeds, it missed an admirable opportunity here to recognize a worthy contender. Perhaps with Mr. Rizley's assistance the CAB will take another look.

That all may know the vital part played by Transocean since 1946, I invite your attention to its splendid record of service in peace and war:

MAJOR AERONAUTICAL SERVICES ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

1946

Air Transport Command; California-Hawaii round trips; volume, 2 per day; duration, 11 months.

1947

United States Navy and Civil Aeronautics Administration; operation Landing Aids Experiment station Arcata, Calif.; duration, 3 years.

United States Army; military dependents Seattle-Tokyo; volume, 750.

United States Army engineers; civilian defense workers; United States-Pacific bases; volume, 25,000 to 30,000.

1948

United States Army; military dependents Germany-United States; volume, 2,700.

United States Army; military dependents Seattle-Tokyo; volume, 700.

International Refugee Organization of United Nations; war refugees from Munich to Caracas, Venezuela; volume, 25,000.

United States Air Force; Berlin Airlift support, United States-Europe; volume, 100 transatlantic flights.

United States Air Force; Berlin Airlift support; United States-Europe; volume, 11 Air Force bomber groups.

United States Air Force supervision; aircraft ferry, United States-China; volume, 158 C-46 aircraft.

International Refugee Organization; evacuees from Shanghai; volume, 13,000.

1949

United States Navy; cargo flights, Seattle-Adak; volume, weekly; duration: 2 years.

Military and Transport Service; cargo flights, California-Orient; volume, weekly; duration: 1 year.

1950

United States Navy; airlift and bush living in Alaska, Petroleum No. 4 project; duration, 2 years.

United States Air Force; airlift California-Tokyo (Korean Airlift); volume, 25 to 35 flights per month; termination, February 1954.

1951

United States Army; movement of domestic military personnel; duration, continuing.

United States Navy and Interior Department; scheduled passenger, cargo and mail flights in the Trust Territories; duration, continuing.

Military and Transport Service; en route service to military transport aircraft at Wake Island; duration, continuing.

1952

United States Navy; modification and overhaul of C-46 aircraft.

State Department; spraying and dusting activities in 21 Middle East countries; duration, continuing.

1953

United States Army; military dependents across the Pacific; volume, 360.

United States Army; transportation of military dependents Europe-United States; volume, 3,400; duration, 2 months.

1954

United States Army; transportation of military dependents Europe-United States; volume, 3,000; duration, January, February.

Completed 43 months of Korean airlift; volume, 17,750,489 aircraft miles, 92,035 aircraft hours, 13.7 hours average daily aircraft utilization.

United States Army; transportation of military dependents between Europe and United States; volume, 306 flights; duration, 6 months.

United States Air Force; miscellaneous flights between the United States and Tokyo.

1948

United States Air Force; overhaul C-54 aircraft by wholly owned subsidiary; volume, 555 aircraft; duration, 4 years by successive contracts.

1953

United States Air Force; overhaul T-33 jet trainers by wholly owned subsidiary; volume, 516 aircraft; duration, 1 year.

Classified movements involving the transportation of nuclear material and airlift to secret bases are not included in the foregoing.

Transocean Air Lines, as is its privilege, will make formal request upon the President to reexamine the facts of this case and to make a secure place for this company in the air-transportation industry.

MRS. ROOSEVELT, MR. DIES DEBATE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much controversy lately as to the truthfulness of certain testimony that was taken before the Dies committee that at this time I desire to read certain correspondence between the chairman of that committee and one of the former first ladies of the land, and the gentleman referred to in that correspondence.

I read:

MRS. ROOSEVELT, MR. DIES DEBATE—RECOLLECTIONS OF EARLY CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY INTO COMMUNISM

(Controversy has arisen over what happened in the early days of the Dies investigation into communism by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It grows out of statements by Representative MARTIN DIES in an interview in the August 20, 1954, issue of U. S. News & World Report. Mrs. Roosevelt questions Mr. DIES' recollection. Mr. DIES, in his reply, draws Mrs. Roosevelt's attention to the same statements made by him repeatedly for 14 years and, he says, without previous challenge from her. Here, in full text, is the exchange of correspondence.)

MRS. ROOSEVELT: "YOUR MEMORY SEEMS QUITE SHORT"

(Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt wrote to Representative DIES on August 17, 1954, as follows:)

DEAR MR. DIES: I have asked Mr. Lawrence to deliver this letter to you as I did not want it to go through the regular mail at the Capitol. As you know, I never make it a practice to answer remarks that are made where they affect me alone but in this case, I must refresh your memory which is quite incorrect.

I never admitted to you, because I could not have, since Mr. Joseph Lash never admitted to me that he had been a Communist. I knew that in the youth organizations he had been close to many Communists and he had helped me greatly to learn about Communist lines of thought, and that I might have told you, but Mr. Lash was never a member of the Communist Party.

If influence such as you describe was used, it was without my knowledge or that of my husband, but I am quite sure that my husband never said, "It would be bad for the Democratic Party to alienate elements friendly to communism."

You are correct about what you say as regards the Youth Congress hearings but incorrect when you say that it was the evidence which disturbed me and made me ask you to the White House. What really disturbed me was the outrageous type of questioning indulged in by Mr. [J. B.] Matthews. The reason I asked you to the White House was because I wished you to know that the Student Union which Mr. Lash organized had been taken over, in spite of Mr. Lash's efforts, by the Communists and they had thrown him and a number of his friends out of office and out of the union. This had never been brought out and I felt that you should know it.

Mr. Lash could not have admitted that he was a Communist but he is away on vacation, and therefore I cannot ask him what he said to you, but no influence was ever brought to bear, as far as I ever knew, on his draft board.

I am constantly being accused of having used influence in ways which, of course, I did not know anything about even, but this is something which might hurt someone else, and therefore I would like the truth to be known both by you and Mr. Lawrence since your memory seems quite short.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

MR. DIES: "I HAVE BEEN SAYING FOR 14 YEARS—"

(Representative DIES replied to Mrs. Roosevelt on August 19, 1954, as follows:)

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT,
Valkill Cottage,
Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. ROOSEVELT: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of August 17th instant, in reference to my report of our meeting at the White House and our discussion of Joe Lash.

For many years since this meeting, I have stated in speeches and articles what occurred upon this occasion. On September 22, 1950, Congressman HAROLD VELDE, of Illinois, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech, which I had made some time prior, in which I detailed the account of my conversation with you concerning Joseph Lash. In view of the fact that my recent statement, which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report, is a repetition of what I have been saying and writing for 14 years, I cannot agree that my memory is short.

Mr. Joseph P. Lash first appeared before our committee on December 1, 1939. He testified at length, under oath, and answered the questions which were propounded to him. His next appearance was before our committee on January 21, 1942, when he again testified, under oath, and contradicted his previous testimony on material points. In the course of his testimony on January 21, 1942, he was asked the following question:

"The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely convinced that you were wrong in being closely associated with the Communists during that period?"

He answered as follows:

"Mr. LASH. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. There is no question in your mind, but that was an error?

"Mr. LASH. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. But it was an error that you made as a result of false beliefs in the objectives of these people?

"Mr. LASH. Yes, sir; that is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. To what extent do you agree with the Communists, to what extent is your association with them and moving in that circle, on what points do you agree with them and on what points do you disagree? I am trying to get the extent of it, not do you now but did you at that time, I mean?

"Mr. LASH. Oh, I thought you were referring to the present. At that time substantially I agreed with their position, Mr. Chairman."

I submit that Mr. Lash's admission before our committee that he had associated closely with the Communists and was in substantial agreement with the Communists was a confession that he was a Communist. It was not necessary for Joseph Lash to be a card-holding member of the Communist Party of the United States to be a Communist. It has been clearly established that some Communists do not hold a formal membership in the party for strategic reasons.

For instance, Mr. Lash was asked the following question by Mr. Matthews: "Were you there as a member of the Young Communist League?"

He answered: "No I was not there as a member of the Young Communist League."

He was then asked: "Were you there as a delegate?" And he answered: "I was never a Communist. I never held a membership card."

He also was asked by Mr. Matthews the following question: "Were you ever, in any circles of the Young Communist League, or in any circles of the Young Communist Party, or otherwise treated in a manner in which they might presumably treat persons who were backing them and taking their instructions, but who, for strategic reasons, were not issued cards of membership?"

Mr. Lash answered: "I worked very closely with them but I have always preserved my independence of judgment."

From 1950 speech

In my speech, which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman VELDE on September 22, 1950, I said:

"There was a perennial youth by the name of Joseph Lash, who was head of the Youth Congress. Joseph Lash had been very active in communism and we exposed him. One day I got a telephone call from Mrs. Roosevelt asking me to have dinner with her.

"Well, I knew something was up because I had heard that Mrs. Roosevelt was trying to persuade Naval Intelligence to give Joseph Lash an appointment. He had never been inducted into the armed services. I went to the White House and there seated in the anteroom were 4 or 5 young Communist youth leaders waiting for Mrs. Roosevelt. They sat at the table with me and Mrs. Roosevelt.

"At the conclusion of the lunch, Mrs. Roosevelt said to me, 'Mr. Congressman, I presume you know why I asked you to have lunch with me.' I said, 'Well, I have an idea. It is about Joseph Lash.' And she said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Mrs. Roosevelt, I have brought the record of Joseph Lash. He perjured himself before our committee.'

"She said, 'Yes; he told me he did but he is very sorry and I think he should have another chance.' I said, 'Well, maybe, but not in Naval Intelligence.' I said, 'Did he tell you he was a member of the Communist Party?' She said, 'Yes; but he was just an idealistic venturesome youth who embraced communism impulsively and now he wants to repent.' I said, 'Mrs. Roosevelt, how do you know he has repented? How can you afford to ask that he be put in Naval Intelligence?'

"Well, we sat around and discussed it pro and con. When I went back to the office, I called the committee together and told them about my conversation with Mrs. Roosevelt. The committee agreed to permit Joseph Lash and his counsel, who was a New Deal official, to appear before it so that he could make his confession and ask for forgiveness.

"Among other things, I asked him why he wasn't in the Army and he was unable to give a satisfactory explanation. Later the committee instructed the secretary to telephone the draft board in New York to find out why Joseph Lash had not been inducted. We were informed that it was because of White House intervention."

I reported my conversation with President Roosevelt during his lifetime, and what I stated in my interview is merely a repetition of what I have been saying for many years. A more detailed account of what I told the President and what he told me may be found in the speech which Congressman VELDE inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Hearings text cited

Your explanation that you sent for me because you wished me to know "that the Student Union which Mr. Lash organized had been taken over, in spite of Mr. Lash's efforts, by the Communists and they had thrown him and a number of his friends out of office and out of the Union," is not borne out by the facts and the record, and on its face is unreasonable. If this were the reason, why did you tell me that Mr. Lash could get a Naval Intelligence appointment if our committee would give him a clean bill of health?

Why did Mr. Lash appear voluntarily before the committee? Why did he admit, on page 2810 of the hearings, that he had applied for a position in Naval Intelligence? Why did he admit, on page 2811 of the hearings, that when he first appeared before the committee in 1939, he "tried not to answer questions because the more I answered questions, the more difficult it made my work in trying to get the Communist influence out of the American Students' Union"? Why did he apologize to the committee for his testimony in 1939?

If you will read the hearings from page 2812 to 2819, you will find that Mr. Lash admitted membership in a number of organizations which he stated were Communist controlled and dominated. If you will search your memory carefully, you will recall that I told you I could not give Mr. Lash a clean bill of health, but that I would afford him an opportunity to appear before the committee if he would agree to tell the truth.

Before summoning the committee, I had Mr. Lash come to my office to find out if he was willing to tell the truth. In our conversation, while he insisted that he had not been a card-holding member of the Communist Party, he agreed that he had been a Communist in all other respects, because of his belief in the Communist program and doctrines and because of his close association with them. And he admitted that he and certain other Communists were not required to join the party formally for strategic reasons. He also agreed that he had not told all the truth when he appeared before the committee in 1939. Upon his assurance that he would be truthful and frank, I summoned the committee.

When Mr. Lash appeared before the committee he was accompanied by counsel.

When he was put under oath and questioned he hedged and was not as frank as he told me he would be. I presume that he had talked to his counsel between the time I talked to him and his appearance before the committee.

Although I have stated publicly many times the basic facts of the Lash affair, this is the first time you have challenged the accuracy of my account of what happened. I am, therefore, surprised that at this late date you should seek to discredit my statement. I am compelled to attribute your belated challenge to a faulty memory.

Very sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES.

(Full text of a letter written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to Representative MARTIN DIES on August 23, 1954:)

DEAR MR. DIES: I am very much interested in your letter [U. S. News & World Report, August 27, 1954]. The fact that you have made statements and speeches for years does not make these statements and speeches truthful.

As you recount the conversation which Mr. [Joseph] Lash had in answering the questions, I see nothing which makes Mr. Lash a Communist. You say that because he was close to them and agreed with many of their positions he must have been a Communist. I disagree with you. At that period there were many things in the Communist doctrine with which many people agreed. It is the development of communism under Lenin and Stalin and the ways of carrying out its doctrines which we are today finding obnoxious and difficult to deal with. I am sure Mr. Lash never considered that he admitted he was a Communist and neither did I ever admit that he was a Communist.

I asked you to luncheon to find out what you thought of Mr. Lash. I did not want him in Naval Intelligence and I don't think I so specified. I had thought he was material for an officer and not for a private. I doubt whether the draft board was interfered with by the White House, but they were perhaps told that an effort was being made by Mr. Lash to find out if he could get a commission. What I was really anxious to get across to you and which I now realize never registered, was that the manner in which the investigation was being done by Mr. [J. B.] Matthews was a shocking performance.

You are quite wrong in saying I did not give you the correct evidence about the Student Union. I gave that exactly as it occurred.

Of course, Joe Lash wanted a clean bill of health and he wanted to get into the Navy as an officer. I did not know that he wanted to get into Naval Intelligence. Of course, he could not get an officer's commission without a clean bill of health from your committee. He apologized to you because he thought he had been rather flippant in answering your questions. I remember the circumstances very well. He had been thrown out and no one had been appointed in his place, so he appeared for an organization which he did not wish to see destroyed and yet he was not actually accepted in that organization. It is true that Mr. Lash and many others were in organizations which were Communist-controlled and dominated but that did not make people Communists, and I assure you Mr. Lash has never been a Communist. His admission that he believed in the program and doctrines does not make him a Communist.

My memory is not faulty. I remember everything very clearly and I will gladly testify under oath. You have not been challenged before because I do not read your statements and speeches. The only reason I read this one was because I saw it in David Lawrence's column.

My husband is dead and I can't speak for him, but I can easily see how he might, in the light of the day in which you were speaking, have said what you say he said, without meaning what you now imply he meant. It is true there was no hysteria in those days and he may have felt there were a great many liberals who were in sympathy with certain Communist doctrines that he and many others might not have wanted to antagonize. My husband knew what the trends were and the differences between what was developing in the Communist Party then and some of the writings and tenets of the Communist Party in the past.

You seem to forget the change brought about under Lenin and Stalin and the change in attitude that has occurred here in consequence.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

(Representative DIES gave the following statement to U. S. News & World Report on Mrs. Roosevelt's letter of August 23, 1954:)

I regard the last letter of Mrs. Roosevelt as a historic document. It shows the thinking and attitude of the Roosevelts with reference to the Communists and Russia. It was this attitude that was responsible for the tragic blunders at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences which brought about the emergence of Russia from a third-rate power to the status of a world menace. I think Mrs. Roosevelt's letter needs no reply since it speaks for itself.

Representative DIES has also made public a letter written to him by Mrs. Roosevelt from the White House on January 23, 1942—2 days after Mr. Lash had appeared before the committee—and says that it is in contradiction to her recent statements. The text of the letter follows:

"MY DEAR MR. DIES: I am sorry that there was any misunderstanding as to the purpose for which I asked you to lunch with me.

"I want to assure you that I had not the slightest intention of trying to exert any pressure on you to do anything which did not arise from your own conviction and sense of fairness, and it never entered my mind to make the slightest attempt to change the decision of the Navy Department. Mr. [Joseph] Lash accepted that decision long ago and has tried since to be useful in the way that seemed to offer itself and await the decision of the Selective Service.

"I simply thought that it might be possible for you in a quiet way to talk to the young man and make up your mind as to whether he is sincere or not. It never occurred to me that this would be taken up again by the full committee. I am convinced of his sincerity and I feel that continuing to pillory him in the public press has a bad effect upon the morale of our young people as a whole.

"Very sincerely yours,

"ELEANOR ROOSEVELT."

(Apropos of Mrs. Roosevelt's references to "the light of the day in which you were speaking," Representative DIES directs attention to the following answer that he made in his interview in the August 20 issue of U. S. News & World Report:)

Question. Did you find in those [late 1941] days that the prevailing view was that the Communists were just another political organization—not connected with the Soviet Government?

Answer. Well, that was partly true. But the evidence was very, very clear. In 1938, in our first report, we unanimously—and that was 5 Democrats and 2 Republicans—found that the real purpose of the Kremlin was world conquest, and that all of this camouflage, all of these tactics, were all solely for the purpose in the end of conquering the world.

So that certainly there was no excuse after 1938—which was when the first report we filed and which was supported by ample evidence—for anyone in the Government to believe that the Communist Party was just another political party. * * *

It's a long story, but, in other words, we fought all the way through. Now, in 1941 I submitted to the Executive a list of about 2,000 Communists on the Federal payrolls, including Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, and others, and asked that they be discharged. They refused to expel them. Then I got the House to appropriate $100,000 for the purpose of financing an investigation by the Department of Justice.

I said to the House and to the administration, "Since you won't take my evidence, I'm going to make the Department of Justice investigate this list and this evidence." I got $100,000 for the work—not with the approval of the administration, for they were not in favor of it—and we overruled them. The Department of Justice then took the information that I had and the evidence and yet flatly refused to do anything about it.

Question. Is this recorded in some letter?

Answer. This is all in the reports; yes, filed in the House of Representatives.

Here's the basis on which they reported back to the House. They said to the House that the Department of Justice had submitted the list to the heads of the departments with the request that the departments indicate which ones they wanted investigated. There were only several departments that asked for any investigation at all, and therefore no investigation was made in the majority of cases.

That list of 2,000, then, stayed there for a little more than a decade before they finally were discharged.

MR. LASH REPLIES TO MR. DIES

(Following is the text of a letter written September 1, 1954, by Joseph P. Lash:)

EDITOR, U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT:

I have been on vacation until today but trust that you will give me an opportunity to comment, even though somewhat belatedly, on what Mr. DIES calls the Case of Joe Lash.

That "case" can be put in a nutshell. Motivated by what H. L. Mencken used to call the Babbitry of the twenties and the depression of the thirties, I became a radical in college. That radicalism led me first into the Socialist Party and later during the period of the Popular Front toward the Communists.

The Nazi-Soviet Pact convinced me that something had gone tragically wrong in the Soviet Union, that the Communist Party here was not a free agent and that cooperation with it was impossible. At the same time the great achievements of the New Deal under Franklin D. Roosevelt showed me that it was possible and desirable to achieve significant social reforms within the framework of the two-party system. I remain of that view.

While it is fashionable now to suggest that communism grew because the Roosevelts were not sufficiently tough-minded about it, the salient fact is that the courage of the Roosevelts restored the faith of millions of people in the American system and confined radicalism in this country to a minority sect. With millions of unemployed and Hitler on the march, this country under Roosevelt did not act from fear but from hope and solved its problems without the outlawing of political parties or thought control.

Mr. DIES' reliability as a witness about this period may be judged by the following:

1. Mr. DIES alleges that Mrs. Roosevelt told him that I had confessed to her to joining the Communist Party in my youth after having denied it under oath before his committee. The Dies committee transcript shows that I was not asked questions about membership in either the Communist Party or the Young Communist League in the appearance before the committee to which Mr. DIES refers, so the matter could not possibly have come up in the discussion with

Mrs. Roosevelt in the form in which Mr. DIES now alleges.

Although I cooperated closely with the Communists in the period of the Popular Front I did not become a member of either the Communist Party or the Young Communist League.

2. Mr. DIES states that when I again appeared before his committee on January 21, 1942 (incidentally my "counsel," Dr. William A. Neilson, was not allowed to come into the meeting with me) I could not explain to his committee why I had not been drafted. "I then called the draft board in New York," asserts DIES, "to find out in the presence of the committee, and the draft board said that because of White House interference they did not draft Lash." It is noteworthy that in his recent letter to Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. DIES has the committee's "secretary" and not himself calling my draft board.

In any event the fact of the matter is that when I appeared before Mr. DIES in 1942 I was 32 years of age and as such automatically in class I-H. This category was set up before Pearl Harbor following congressional legislation deferring all men from 28-35. At the end of January 1942 Selective Service headquarters announced that it was having local draft boards review the cases of all registrants over 28. In the course of that review I was reclassified and I applied for immediate induction.

Clearly if at the time of my appearance before the committee I had wanted to stay out of the draft, which I did not, there was no need for pressure from anybody since I was in I-H.

While I never sought special consideration from the draft board, some members of the DIES committee, and former Representative Parnell Thomas, Representative of New Jersey, particularly, demanded publicly that Selective Service give me special treatment by having me transferred out of I-H to a classification calling for immediate induction.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. LASH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SCRIVNER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS and include remarks of Minority Leader MARTIN on the TV program Voice of the Nation last Sunday.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. LANE in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. VORYS.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of serious illness in family.

Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), until February 27, on account of official business.

Mr. GUBSER, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 10, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

392. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

393. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

394. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

395. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

396. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work"; to the Committee on Public Works.

397. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Supplemental report. H. R. 3406. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 20, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 3741. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Haileyville School District, No. 11, at Haileyville, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3742. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 3743. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3744. A bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3745. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 3746. A bill relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 3747. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 3748. A bill to provide for the application of prevailing wage policy to officers, members, and positions of the fire department for the Washington National Airport; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3749. A bill to provide for the application of prevailing wage policy to officers, members, and positions of the police force for the Washington National Airport; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3750. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3751. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3752. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to certain lands in Hancock County, Miss., conveyed as swamp and overflowed land by the State of Mississippi to private individuals in 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3753. A bill to set aside the action of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to the reassignment of certain Fire Department personnel; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3754. A bill to require that all officers of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be appointed on the basis of competitive civil-service examinations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 3755. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3756. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3757. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3758. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3759. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3760. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3761. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3762. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3763. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3764. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3765. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3766. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3767. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3768. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 3769. A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3770. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3771. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3772. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3773. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3774. A bill to permit involuntarily separated postmasters, when post offices are discontinued, to acquire classified civil-service status through noncompetitive civil-service examinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3775. A bill to provide for a municipal auditorium for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3776. A bill relating to the information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3777. A bill relating to the information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the accelerated amortization of certain devices and equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3779. A bill to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, by World War II prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3780. A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3781. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1348); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3782. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes (7 U. S. C. 1441); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3783. A bill to continue through December 31, 1957, the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3784. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937 (16 U. S. C., sec. 590x-3), as amended, to provide additional credit facilities for farm enlargement and development and to assist beginning farmers to become farm owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3785. A bill to provide for stockpiling an adequate national safety reserve of food and fiber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3786. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3787. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3788. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3789. A bill to amend section 315 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934 to withdraw from individuals convicted of subversive activities and members of certain subversive organizations the right of equal opportunity for the use of broadcasting facilities in political campaigns; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3790. A bill to accelerate consideration by the courts of criminal proceedings involving treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities, and to increase to 15 years the statute of limitations applicable to such offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3791. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3792. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3793. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3794. A bill to establish the rank and grade of the Chief of Naval Material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 3795. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3796. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3797. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3798. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3799. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3800. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide a permanent procedure for adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis, to regulate the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3801. A bill to amend section 1016 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for carrying charges on unimproved and unproductive real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3802. A bill to provide for the correction of inequities under the Excess Profits

Tax Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3803. A bill to provide that in the construction of reservoirs by the United States, consideration shall be given to the future development of such reservoirs and the surrounding area for recreational purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3804. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 3805. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3806. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 3807. A bill to define the term "substantially gainful occupation" in determination of eligibility for non-service-connected pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3808. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for disability incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3809. A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3810. A bill to revise the basis for certain disability awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 3811. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3812. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3813. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3814. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 3815. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3816. A bill to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of the public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3817. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3818. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3819. A bill to consolidate and revise certain provisions of law relating to additional compensation of civilian employees of the Federal Government stationed outside the continental United States and in Alaska, except as otherwise authorized herein, and to facilitate recruitment, reduce turnover, and compensate for extra costs and hardships due to oversea assignments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3820. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States, for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3821. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3822. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3823. A bill to permit partially disabled veterans to reenlist in the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3824. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3825. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3826. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3827. A bill to amend section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C., sec. 253 (c)) so as to authorize transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or payment of a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation in kind to members of the uniformed services for the transportation of baggage and household effects in a house trailer or mobile dwelling; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3828. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3829. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to designate Mrs. Elizabeth (Ben) Kennedy as "United States GI Mother"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in October of each year as National Grandmothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third week in April of each year as National My Family Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of Senators from States hereafter admitted to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to establish May 14 of every year as WAC-Veterans Day in recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a nuclear power reactor in Japan; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the condolences of Congress to the families of officers and crew members of the USS *Bennington* who lost their lives in the explosions on May 26, 1954, and commending those who displayed gallantry and devotion to duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution providing for annual address to the Congress by the Chief Justice of the United States on the state of the judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a special study of the ways in which existing and proposed Federal economic powers and programs can make their greatest contribution to defense against modern atomic attack; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution extending greetings on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the creation of Fort Ticonderoga to the director; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 137. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINE:

H. Res. 138. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States

to act promptly and favorably upon the Canton irrigation distribution system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3830. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Atamant Chantikian and her child, Kosrof Chantikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of Oscar Neumann, Mrs. Magdalena Neumann, and Judith Gabrielle Neumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Kervok Sevag, Mrs. Virginia Sevag, and Sonia Sevag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Alex Premysler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3835. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3836. A bill for the relief of James E. Savage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 3837. A bill for the relief of Lazar Petrovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 3838. A bill for the relief of Anastasio Cauchon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3839. A bill for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3840. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Fleischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3841. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma and Mrs. Tsugie Azuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3842. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3843. A bill for the relief of Roseen Koury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Michaela Murphy Mole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3846. A bill for the relief of Poulicos S. Loucacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Panayotis Koutsoyannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of Daisy Cecile Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jill (Wiggett) Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 3850. A bill for the relief of George L. Maronitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 3851. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3854. A bill for the relief of Kui Hung Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Grace Janet Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Leopoldine Simonetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3858. A bill for the relief of Gee Yon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis John Foradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 3860. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumtang Subia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3861. A bill for the relief of George Seeman Jensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3862. A bill for the relief of Berthilde Vogler Ganno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3863. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yio Gik Him, nee Guadalupe Reyes Chip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3865. A bill for the relief of George McPherson Gray (Reginald Pugh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3866. A bill for the relief of Leon Popiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam Bonk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3868. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Proudian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3870. A bill for the relief of Oswald E. Kohlruss, Antonie Kohlruss, and Evelyne Hedy Kohlruss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3871. A bill for the relief of Orville Ennis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3872. A bill for the relief of Adolf and Rosa Iliescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

85. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Travis Hayden and others, Atascosa County Farm Bureau, Jourdanton, Tex., requesting that the import duty be increased on broom corn to $55 per ton in order to protect the market at home; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, Yalta is a word that will live in infamy in history. On this 10th anniversary of the ill-fated meeting between Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston S. Churchill, which started February 7 in 1945, we should remind ourselves of the tragic events that have occurred in the decade since that meeting during which the whole series of World War II agreements have been misinterpreted, ignored, or violated by the Soviets to enslave millions of free peoples.

Two years ago, in accordance with one of the first foreign-policy requests of President Eisenhower, I introduced House Joint Resolution 200, declaring that the United States reject any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjection of free peoples; and proclaiming the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them.

This resolution was unanimously reported by our committee, without amendment, but this denunciation of Soviet misinterpretation and violations of the Yalta agreement became involved in a partisan debate as to whether the Yalta agreements and other ill-considered wartime agreements could safely be repudiated in toto, and the House took no further action on the resolution.

In August 1953, however, the House had another opportunity to act in this regard. On August 1, I secured unanimous consent for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 178, "expressing the hopes of the American people for the early reunification of Germany by free elections and for the achievement by the

peoples of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and other Communist-dominated countries of their basic human rights and freedom."

This was a combination of a number of resolutions by various Members of Congress. My own contribution was one sentence, "that the Congress commends and encourages the valiant struggle of these captive peoples for freedom."

This combination resolution passed the House without a single objection and was substituted by Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 by Mr. WATKINS, of Utah. The Senate concurred in the House amendment and thus this resolution represents a formal concurrent expression of the House and Senate on the results of Yalta.

This action, which took place during the closing days of the 1st session of the 82d Congress, has not received the attention it deserves. Many Members of Congress have introduced resolutions on this subject. Each such resolution causes encouragement to the captive peoples when it is introduced, and a measure of discouragement that it fails of final approval. I learned, from my experience with my own resolution, and from my efforts to resolve and adjust the differences in the series of resolutions which were combined in House Concurrent Resolution 178, how difficult it is to secure language which is satisfactory to many Members who may have a single purpose in view. Under the circumstances, I am proud to have had a part in putting through House Concurrent Resolution 178. I am proud that this resolution was unanimously approved by both the House and Senate and that it contains the sentence I inserted, "that the Congress commends and encourages the valiant struggle of these captive peoples for freedom."

On this somber 10th anniversary, the Polish nation, the prime victim of the Yalta deal, and the other nations victimized by Soviet imperialism, can take heart in knowing that this recent and unanimous condemnation and encouragement of their struggle for freedom stands unchanged as an official expression of Congress.

At Yalta, Poland Was Betrayed and Enslaved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the time is February 7, 1955.

The American people are restive, fearful that another secret arrangement may be in process that will sanction Communist aggression and dishonor the principles by which we live.

Even as the blunders at Yalta deprived Poland of its independence, led to the enslavement of other peoples who trusted us, and opened the way to the spread of communism which now threatens the world.

Secret diplomacy continues to be the curse of international relations.

It is dictatorial by nature, considering itself superior to the common sense and character of the people.

In its preoccupation with convenience and expediency, it loses sight of moral values.

Even in the United States today, for narrow partisan reasons, the true facts of Yalta are withheld from the people, while subtle negotiations are going on that will lead to the admission of Red China to the United Nations by the back door.

Appeasement on the installment plan. This will not fool the people.

We never endorsed the Yalta deal with Red Russia, and we will never approve of a Red China deal.

Communism must purge itself of every aggression committed against every other nation.

This is the policy of the American people, based on moral principles that we will never compromise or surrender.

In justice to the Polish people, first victims of the new appeasement, we denounce the furtive Yalta agreements.

Until those freedoms which have been betrayed are restored the freedom of the United States is in danger.

God grant us leadership with the courage to be right and honorable.

Negation of the Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1955, marked the 10th anniversary of the Yalta Conference which culminated in the controversial and widely criticized Yalta agreement.

On a number of separate occasions since my first election to Congress, I stated on this floor that I favor the negation of that agreement. I wish to reiterate and reaffirm that position today.

I believe that I have made it very plain that I have no sympathy for the extremist critics of the Yalta agreement, whose vociferous condemnations were founded in political expediency rather than in any sincere desire to repair the damage done by the pact. Nevertheless, it has been my steadfast contention that the agreement was shortsighted and, in the provision dealing with the eastern boundary of Poland, inconsistent with the traditional policies and principles of the American people. For these reasons, I had repeatedly urged that the negation of the entire Yalta agreement, which can be accomplished on valid grounds, be given favorable consideration.

There are several basic reasons for the negation of the Yalta agreement. In the first place, it is uncertain that the late President Roosevelt intended to enter into an agreement at Yalta which would be legally binding on the United States.

Secondly, there is no body of established precedents with respect to Executive agreements to show that any one of them is to be regarded as valid beyond the term in office of the Chief Executive who entered into it. In conjunction with this point, we should note that there is nothing in the Yalta agreement as to its intended duration.

Thirdly, the Yalta agreement has been in effect nullified by the repeated violations of its terms on the part of the Soviet Union. This is perhaps the chief reason why we should negate the agreement.

The negation of the Yalta pact will not free Poland, any more than the absence of this agreement would have prevented Soviet occupation of that country. We must remember that at the time of the Yalta Conference the Soviet armies had already moved through Poland and were within 32 miles of Berlin. Even if the Yalta agreement had never materialized, it would probably have been necessary to start a new war in 1945 in order to free Poland of Soviet occupation. I need not add that the allies, led by the United States, were not in favor of such a course at the time. It was believed during that period that the restoration of independence to the Eastern European nations could be achieved gradually through peaceful means. This belief, of course, had proved to be completely unjustified with the passage of time.

The negation of the Yalta agreement would, however, give us a starting point for demanding the restoration of Poland's proper boundaries and Poland's return to the family of free nations.

If the persons who had clamored for the repudiation of the Yalta pact are sincere, I urge them to lend their efforts to the task of bringing about the negation of the agreement.

United States "Dorchester Day"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there is a heroic story of the sea which has earned its right to be forever memorialized in the history of our country. It is a story valuable to the American tradition because it is a lesson in the essential unity of our people and their separate faiths—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish. It is a story of sublime sacrifice by men of religion who thus gave concrete, physical expression to their religious ideals. It is altogether a story so rich in human drama, so gripping on the imagination, and so colored by crisis and excitement at sea in time of war, that I ask the event be set down in the official calendar of American holidays. To me it is essentially a story of basic American solidarity.

It is for these reasons that I have introduced into the first session of this, the 84th Congress of the United States, House Joint Resolution 77. It designates the 3d day of February in each year as Dorchester Day. In doing this we shall commemorate the sinking of the Army transport *Dorchester* by enemy action off the coast of Greenland on the day thus set apart. You will remember that was the tragedy at sea when four Army chaplains of different religious faiths lost their lives because—according to the reports of survivors—they pressed upon soldiers caught helpless on the sinking craft, their own lifebelts. They then perished together, linked arm in arm, in the high seas.

What the record does not and cannot show—because of the dreadful circumstances of the tragedy—is something I take the liberty to assume. I assume that when these four noble Americans—Catholic, Protestants, and Jew—went down into the ice and the water of that awful night, they uttered a common prayer in a joint plea to the God and Father of all men. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, an act of incredible neglect that an event written in terms of grand tragedy, so meaningful for all future generations of Americans, should thus go undistinguished on the calendar of the days we honor. Therefore, I ask that this year this omission be corrected and that this House act favorably on my measure.

Subsidies Became Our Lifeblood—The Remedies Now Appearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Government took by force private property by taxation and gave big gobs of it to the beef cattlemen. In effect, beef became the public property of the Government. More and more people went into raising beef for Government subsidies. Surpluses of cattle increased. Prices to the consumers were fixed high by the Government, in spite of increasing surpluses.

BEEF REVOLTS

Suddenly the people quit eating beef. They struck. Just as suddenly the sturdy big-hatted ranchers woke up to the fact that they were raising socialized beef for Government, a most unreliable political customer. They had lost their real dependable customers, the American people. So the cattlemen took a vote and threw out Government price supports and control of their business. They chose the hard road of winning back their customers in a free beef market. That meant lower prices, but increased beef consumption from 62 to 76 pounds per capita—an alltime record. Congress was not smart enough to stop subsidies, but the cattlemen were.

POTATOES GAIN FREEDOM

The potato growers were corrupted for years by Government checks totaling $478 million. They, too, delivered their potatoes to the Government instead of the consumers. Suddenly the taxpayers were shocked to see the Government paying farmers for potatoes with taxpayers' money, then burning the potatoes to make them scarce to keep the prices high. To make it worse, after destroying the potatoes on one side of the road, the Government bought potatoes from Canada to feed the people on the other side. Year after year Congress could not stop it. The growers themselves did stop it. Potatoes won their freedom from Government. And tough as freedom is, potatoes would not go back into socialism, viz, management, ownership, and control by the Government.

PEOPLE REJECT GOVERNMENT HOUSING TOO

In the same way the Government has been insisting on taking by force of taxation uncountable millions of private property and building publicly owned Government houses. It rents them at half rent, exempt from taxation. Here again uncountable millions of taxes must be paid by private property owners which Government tenants should but do not pay. They are exempt.

Of course, Government expects tenants to vote right in return for such favors. A very narrow majority in Congress has been insisting lately on forcing public houses onto the people in spite of the fact that the people do not want them. Generally wherever the people vote they throw out Government housing, keep their own money at home and build their own houses. Constitutional amendments are proposed to stop this sort of Government business.

SCHOOLBOYS UNDERSTAND BUT CONGRESS DOES NOT

Now come the people of Tennessee telling the true story of TVA, the first and most highly touted of American socialistic experiments. It is turning out very badly for Tennessee. For Tennessee has become totally dependent upon Government for electric power and appropriations from Congress. It is falling behind the other 10 Southeastern States in production and distribution. That is because the other States are not dependent on what Congress may or may not do. The other States make and pay for their own electric power and depend on themselves. Tennessee has found by bitter experience that business firms will not move into their State where electric power depends on Congress taking money by force from far-distant States. What's more, Congress is finding it more and more impossible to buy votes in Tennessee by charging the cost to Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, and other States. Even the little schoolboys now define TVA as "a river that flows through 7 States and drains 41." They were drained again in 1954 for the 22d year. TVA will be coming up to the public trough again in 1955. The total take to date by TVA is about $2 billion—all from taxpayers. That will help heat Tennessee houses with electricity, though Tennesseans have plenty of coal in their backyards which they could use. They could also use oil like other people. But it is cheaper to use electricity so long as taxpayers in other States can be socked to provide it. But Tennessee knows that no scheme to buy votes as crazy and incredible as TVA can last. This administration has already given fair warning. So Mr. Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., vice president of Guaranty Mortgage & Trust Co., of Memphis, Tenn., comes up with this remedy. He proposed a new and greater TVA in Spotlight for the Nation.

He suggests that the power-generating facilities of TVA be sold to the people in the area which it serves. This would result in relief for the taxpayers of the remainder of the Nation and at the same time give to the people of the TVA reservation exclusive control over the agency upon which they are completely dependent for their power. Perhaps even more important than these immediate tangible gains, is the fact that such a sale would represent a reversal of the largest, most clear-cut Socialist step the United States has ever taken.

I have been criticized for characterizing TVA as socialistic. However, my opinion conforms with that of the authorities. The Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of February 15, 1934, quotes Norman Thomas as saying:

> The TVA is the only genuinely socialistic act (in the New Deal)—a flower in the midst of weeds.

Of course, TVA has never been officially represented as being the first Socialist experiment undertaken in the United States. But it is common knowledge that the Public Utility League pressed for passage of TVA legislation all through the 1920's. It was finally passed in the early days of the New Deal as conservation, flood control, and navigation legislation.

Since that time about $2 billion of capital has been invested in and used to finance TVA. Only $101.1 million has been repaid and that merely represents a credit on the books. The 1954 appropriation to TVA was $188,546,000, which is about the average of congressional advances that have been made in recent years. Thus, in a single year, Congress appropriated $87 million more than TVA was credited for repayments during its entire life of 23 years.

Except for a low rate of interest paid on about $65 million worth of bonds which were bought by the United States Treasury, TVA has paid no interest on the capital advances made to it. It has been estimated that if TVA repaid the Federal Government for the interest costs alone of Federal moneys spent through TVA, the bills from TVA to its customers would have to be increased over $40 million a year.

TVA pays no Federal taxes at all. Therefore, it does not contribute a dime of its proper share in our national defense. It pays nothing toward the salaries of the Congress and the President. In 1954 the Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, paid $113,442,477 in State and Federal taxes, or about 24.4 percent of its revenues. TVA, in 1954, paid $3,578,668 in lieu of State taxes, or 2.7 percent of its revenues.

From the foregoing it is clear that about 24 cents out of every dollar of power bills paid by customers of private utility companies is used in part to pay the costs, the taxes, the interest, and the capital of TVA, which it should pay for but does not.

The TVA is so weak and totally dependent on what Congress will do that it cannot build new power facilities to meet the growing demand for power; it cannot pay interest or principal; the payment of proper taxes alone would sink the TVA ship. In a debate on the floor of the Senate — 1939 — Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, the author of the TVA legislation, had this to say:

> A proposal from a great association of Tennessee says, in effect, "Let the TVA property be subject to taxation the same as everybody else's property." * * * If we go to that extreme, Senators, you can see that the TVA would be out of business in 3 months.

For 20 years Congress indulged itself in a kind of vote-getting game, sometimes under the lash of a President, to redistribute the wealth. They indulged in doing good with other people's money without too much disturbance to conscience. If conscience were disturbed, alleged national defense relieved it.

But by now each group getting the benefits of the redistribution are running head on into each other or running out of benefits. Indeed the mess, which Congress came into power 2 years ago to clean up, has smeared the faces of those who have quite diligently wrestled with it.

WHICH SUBSIDY TO KNOCK OUT FIRST

If there are critics of the failure of Congress to reverse the New Deal trend and reduce taxes much more, let them answer these questions. Which particular group feeding in the public trough would they knock out first? Which subsidy law would they repeal to start with? They must be repealed one at a time. That is, which group's vote would they risk losing first? The attempt has been made.

CORN ATTACKS PEANUTS

In the last session of Congress the Illinois delegation in Congress representing corn attacked peanuts. Corn having been for nearly 20 years in the public trough and feeling quite secure said in effect: "Now what basic rights have peanuts to put their feet in this trough?" "Why the country would never miss them if we never raised another peanut. They are indigestible anyway." And corn called for a vote of all the others to throw peanuts out. Whereupon peanuts furiously counterattacked with most devastating effect. They said, "Why of all those feeding in this trough that have grown sleek and fat and should be thrown out, it's corn. Above all others it should fall on its knees and ask forgiveness for its sins in the well of this House." So little peanuts, who really had no case at all shamed corn and scared the others so that the vote was 228 to 170 to keep peanuts in. After the fight it appeared that peanuts might get nearly as much subsidy as corn got for keeping itself padlocked in cribs so as to make itself look scarce and high priced.

APPLES TAKE INTEREST

After that vote in which peanuts did so well, apples were heard tumbling all over themselves out in the Halls of Congress. They said, "Why sure enough we are just as basic as any of the rest. Besides we can be kept by freezing. What's more basic than an apple a day keeping the doctor away?" In the distance you could hear groups without number organizing the votes. So every seat in the House may be endangered unless the Member votes to give each new group theirs for no good reason except that all the others are getting theirs. When I asked a friend on the floor if this would ever stop, he answered "No; it will go on forever." Of course it must go on forever unless an overall reversal and total stoppage is devised. For if corn subsidies are lawful, the steer, the cow, the pig, and chicken that eats corn must be subsidized. And so it must go on and on without end until it is all stopped.

GOVERNMENT SUBSTITUTE FOR GOD

Does history not prove that when Government controls the economic laws of food, it controls the moral laws of people surrounding food? If Government owns your house, and rents it to you, it will tell you how to live in it. You may commit one sin or have one illegitimate child in Government housing but not two. This is the rule in the housing authority book of morals in Houston, Tex. You are free to vote, of course, but if you vote against the party that provided your house you may expect to move. And so all dependents on Government power loans, health, houses, fruits of fields and forest must do the will of Government and not of God. Government pretends to be a substitute for God. The remedy is to reject the idea utterly.

CONGRESS NEEDS HELP OF THE STATES

The people of the United States have witnessed two decades of unprecedented assumption of governmental power, confiscation of private property by taxation, inflation, and debts. As the Government has grown in power and property the individual has been correspondingly reduced in property and weakened in his power to manage his own affairs.

The January 25, 1955, issue of Look magazine concludes that these conditions are here to stay, regardless of which political party wins. This is so because each party tries to be elected by promising to exercise the unlimited power of Government to tax and spend and borrow to satisfy special interest groups in return for their votes. Indeed, this is in itself a fatal blow to the two-party system and makes the one-party or monolithic state inevitable. It makes no sense to have two candidates each with the same idea.

Resistance to the trend has been wholly ineffectual. The economic groups affected either use the Government's power for their special advantage or seek exemption from it in return for votes. Presidents and Congresses will not do anything about this situation because as long as they have unlimited power they will use it to satisfy these groups. It should be obvious, therefore, that unlimited Government is absurd.

The remedy can be found in this paraphrase of Edmund Burke:

> When government acquires unlimited power, good men must associate; else they will fall, 1 by 1, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.

And so, united action of good men has become apparent and necessary. This effort must be made in and by the States. As parties to the original contract, they must come forward to redefine, clarify, and reaffirm the limitations of that contract.

The Eternal Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of a private preview of the motion picture, The Eternal Sea, at the invitation of a friend and acquaintance of mine for many years, the producer and director, Mr. John H. Auer.

The Eternal Sea is a present-day historical episode of the actual experiences of a living Navy admiral, and it is not only an inspiring patriotic story but also an impelling story which would increase the admiration of any American for the United States Navy and the courageous spirit that overcomes all obstacles including physical handicaps to obtain its objectives.

The Eternal Sea will also assure the American people of the security and protection for which the great and powerful United States Navy has been built and organized to provide.

Mr. John Auer, the director and producer, is a devoted and patriotic naturalized American citizen. He came to the United States in 1929 and in that same year took his first oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, as he says in very broken English. He resolved to serve his new country to the best of his ability, and in 1951 he produced and directed the picture Thunderbirds, which was dedicated to the National Guard. This picture was highly received by all, and Mr. Auer received a citation from the Department of Defense and the National Guard for his patriotic contribution.

The Eternal Sea, which Mr. Auer directed and produced for Republic Pictures, pays homage to the United States Navy, naval aviation, and above all to a courageous American who, despite the great handicap of losing his leg in battle, carried on to express undying devotion to his family, the service, and all mankind. This great American is Rear Adm. John Madison Hoskins, who is still on active duty with the United States Navy.

Private showings of the Eternal Sea have been given to many high officials in the Department of Defense, and a few of

the comments received as a result of these showings follow:

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,
President, Republic Pictures Corp:

Congratulations on a truly great American epic of courage. The Eternal Sea is excellent theater and gripping entertainment. It will make all who see it prouder than ever before of their American heritage. In behalf of all those who have borne wounds for their country and for those other Americans who have triumphed over disability, our heartfelt thanks for this fine film.

Maj. Gen. MELVIN J. MAAS,
USMCR, Retired; Chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,
Republic Productions, Inc.:

The Eternal Sea was reviewed by the Department of Navy and the Office of the Secretary of Defense and hereby is approved for public release. We believe it is a picture you should be proud of. It captures a fine spirit and will be of great value to the service. Its inspirational qualities should be of great value to every American. We consider it an excellent motion picture which justifies our cooperation. Sincere thanks for a job well done.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,
President, Republic Studios:

Congratulations to you, Mr. John Auer, and Republic studios on the Eternal Sea. It is a great picture which will reflect much credit to Republic and Navy. Feel that it will have strong dramatic and human-interest appeal to general public.

Adm. W. G. BEECHER,
Chief of Information, Navy Department.

I urge all patriotic Americans to see this picture not only because of its dramatic appeal, but especially because of its pariotic and inspirational qualities.

Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is the 10th anniversary of the Yalta Conference, at which Russia promised free elections to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other lands now behind the Iron Curtain.

In the 10 years that have passed, we have seen this solemnly pledged word betrayed again and again. The gallant people of Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe groan under a totalitarian regime.

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small." Just as surely as the daylight follows the darkness, as truth and justice ultimately prevail over deceit and wickedness, the time will come when the people of Poland and the other enslaved lands will once again breathe the air of freedom. The United States will never forget its goal of free elections for the unhappy people of Eastern Europe.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of my statement registering my opposition with the House Ways and Means Committee against H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, the case for the extension of reciprocal trade has one fatal weakness; it cannot explain away the harm that would be done to the American textile industry (in company with some other industries) by forcing it to compete in our domestic market, with foreign goods produced at a fraction of our labor costs.

The wage gap cannot be rationalized into balance.

And protection is stripped away from those of our industries that need it.

With their eyes on export opportunities for some industries, the supporters of Reciprocal Trade would sacrifice textiles, watchmaking, fishing, and other industries.

They would sell out our textile industry to Japan, giving up our self-sufficiency, and making us dependent upon other nations for the cloth we once manufactured ourselves just to provide extra export-markets for favored industries under the guise of international cooperation.

And what of the tens of thousands of Americans who would be added to the labor surplus existing in so many of our textile manufacturing communities?

Studies prove that these middle-aged unemployed are not absorbed by growth industries. Those few who do find other work, have to back down into jobs that barely pay the so-called minimum wage, better known as the starvation wage.

Our duty is toward our own people first even unto the least of them.

Not to give away a vital but hard-pressed industry just to promote international good will.

Gentlemen, I ask you not to dodge this fact.

Look at the labor-surplus areas in the United States.

Observe how many of them are depressed textile communities.

Consider the inevitable damage you would inflict upon these communities by opening the gates to competing imports produced at one-half to one-tenth of the wages necessary to maintain the average American worker's standard of living.

And ask yourselves if there is any possible justification for doing this to the people of our textile communities.

The gross hourly earnings of the textile industry in the United States range from a high of $1.59 in Connecticut to a low of $1.22 in Alabama and Georgia.

This disparity has brought real hardship to New England textiles.

But if we have to contend with unlimited competition from low-cost imports, our situation will become hopeless.

On this the battling factions of the American textile industry join ranks in united opposition to reciprocal trade.

Reciprocity would be impossible.

The traffic would be all one way—an invasion of our home market by foreign textiles that would put most of our mills out of business and would add to the critical unemployment prevailing in this industry.

For the mills in Georgia and Alabama could not compete with the mills in Great Britain that pay only 45.5 cents per hour, or those in Japan whose labor costs are at the impossibly low level of only 11.9 cents per hour.

And if these fatal figures are not enough to convince you that reciprocal trade would be a death sentence for our textile industry, I put to you this further challenge: Why should we encourage imports of those manufactured goods that we are overproducing ourselves?

It would be just as senseless and inhuman to import agricultural commodities at half price or less to add to our own surpluses.

We from the textile areas demand the same consideration in our domestic market as that enjoyed by agriculture which has the protection of Government supports.

We submit that it is grossly unfair and dangerous to coddle one industry and abandon another.

Those who beat the drums for free trade slide over the fact that we cannot compete with slave-labor products that are admitted to the American markets without abandoning our own progress and retreating to the 19th century.

They also ignore the fact that there is no such thing as unlimited competition.

We have laws on our own books to guarantee a minimum wage that is already considered to be inadequate.

That minimum will soon be raised and rightly so.

The extension of reciprocal trade would result in the cancellation of that law by indirection. It is a thinly disguised move, among other purposes, to increase Japanese textile exports to the United States at the expense of our own textile industry. It would drive mills and workers out of business, bringing back all the abuses of unfair competition.

Healthy trade depends upon the import of those products or materials that we need and the export of such goods as others want from us.

We cannot risk the delegation of arbitrary authority over such matters through the medium of a blank check.

Where it is clear that some industries will be hurt they must be given some protection in the national interest.

We oppose extension of reciprocal trade as being too large a grant of power.

The American textile industry needs sympathetic understanding and assistance from the Federal Government in place of the proposed legislation which threatens its survival.

Address Delivered by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before the Montgomery County Republican Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 2, 1955, at the Congressional Country Club, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND delivered an address before the Montgomery County Republican organization.

The force and scope of that address so impressed me that I ask unanimous consent to have it made part of today's RECORD.

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

DEFENSE OF THE PACIFIC

(Address by Senator WILLIAM E. KNOWLAND)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, we are gathered here to pay tribute not only to our first President but to discuss in the limited time that we have some of the accomplishments of the administration of a great American and outstanding President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower. Now in the few years that he has occupied the office of President of the United States, he has given leadership to this Nation and has helped to bring our economy back to our free economic system which built this Nation of ours from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a great Nation of 165 million people with the most productive industrial and agricultural economy the world has ever known. When he took office, the Nation was under a system of controls—price controls, wage controls, and the allocation of materials. And in conformity with the platform pledges, they were removed. The cost to the Federal Government in the limited period of time he has occupied the White House has been cut by more than $10 billion. The American people have been given substantial tax reductions by the last Congress amounting to over $7½ billion. In addition to that we have had a better administration of the Federal Government. We have had a number of reorganization acts passed. We have created the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President, who perhaps more than any other man has a keen knowledge of the defense needs of the Nation, has been giving his personal attention to the increasing of the firepower of our armed services in the troubled world in which we find ourselves. There has been an extension of social-security legislation and the unemployment-reserves legislation.

But tonight I want to talk with you about one of the great problems that concerns us not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. I speak of the issue now growing up in the Pacific relating to the defenses of this Nation and the defenses of the free world. It has been my position, and I believe it has been the position of responsible Republicans in the administration and in the Congress of the United States, that in these grave problems facing our Nation, Americans regardless of their partisan affiliation must stand shoulder to shoulder in meeting whatever the challenge that may confront us. I have said time and time again that there is only one party of treason in our Nation. That is the Communist Party and all Americans should stand shoulder to shoulder in seeing that that does not subvert our institutions. So it happens that in addition to being the anniversary of the first of our Republican Presidents, the month of February is also another anniversary and one that we do not remember quite as timely. This coming week is the 10th anniversary of the Yalta conference which met in the Crimea 10 years ago from February 4 to February 11, and in that brief span of 1 decade, the Communist world has increased its hold upon human beings—increased it from 200 million in 1945 until today they control more than 800 millions of people as we meet here tonight. This has been a tremendous change in the world's balance of power. The President of the United States this past week came to the Congress with a message dealing with the critical situation in Formosa and in the far Pacific. He made his recommendations, and in a display of national unity seldom equaled in our Nation, the House by a vote of 410 to 3, and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3 approved the necessary resolution supporting the President. Now I believe that this was a demonstration of President Eisenhower's fundamental belief in our constitutional system of Government. There are some who legalistically might argue that as Commander in Chief, it was not necessary for him to come to the Congress of the United States, but he has felt and he has known that under our constitutional system, the President and the Congress are coequal branches of the Federal Government. He has never wanted and he has never expected and does not want and does not expect the Congress of the United States to be a mere rubber stamp. And in this great problem which confronted our Nation and after consultation not alone with his own party leaders in the House and the Senate but on a bipartisan basis with the Democratic leaders as well, he determined to submit the matter to the Congress so that we could present to our friends abroad and to the would-be aggressors abroad a demonstration of what a great and free constitutional Republic can do when it has finally been challenged in the matter that affects its own vital security interests. And that was done. Now there are some who tried to make out that this resolution was an act or a prelude to an act of aggression on our part. It was no such thing. Those who made charges of that kind knew that they were not true. There is not a single scintilla of evidence to support any such thesis that this was anything other than what the President purported it to be and that was an effort to stabilize conditions in the Pacific and to preserve the peace of the world. It was on this basis and after free and full debate in the House and in the Senate of the United States that he received overwhelming approval. Now some may have asked what is the importance of Formosa in this scheme of things as far as our defense is concerned. Formosa is not some isolated island in the Pacific.

It contains 9½ million of free Chinese. This is a larger population than 32 members of the United Nations have today. It is a larger population than such important countries as Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Austria, Ireland, and New Zealand, and it is the approximate population of Australia. So, in itself from a population point of view, it is important that it not pass behind the Iron Curtain. But what is more important is that it is a part of a defense chain in the Pacific for ourselves and the free world which runs from the Aleutians down through Japan through our great air base at Okinawa through Formosa to the Philippines and anchors on Australia. And if the island of Formosa should pass into unfriendly hands, it would drive a wedge into the heart of that defense position. It would outflank Okinawa a few hundred miles to the north and would outflank the Philippines a few hundred miles to the south. The thing that is difficult for me to understand is how some of our associates in the United Nations or elsewhere constantly feel that the way of solving the problem with the Communist world is by taking the road to appeasement. The world should have learned at the time of Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan. Now we have drawn a line in the Pacific. It is for the purpose of preserving the peace in the Pacific and the peace of the world. There is no intent of aggression against any other nation on the face of the earth. But if our Air Force is challenged and fired upon, they are not going to sit there as sitting ducks. They are going to fire back with effective fire. If our fleet which in consultation with the Government of the Republic of China may be used for a screening opposition is subjected to attack, they in turn will defend themselves. But this, Mr. Chou En-lai and Mr. Mao Tse-tung should understand; they should understand in advance. If there is trouble in the Pacific, it will come because they have precipitated it. And if they precipitate trouble in the Pacific, they must know in advance that there will never again be a Yalu River sanctuary behind which they can go to rearm and refuel. Now we must not be deceived by those who would think that we can get a cheap and easy solution to this problem through the course of appeasement.

There are some who believe that this doctrine of so-called peaceful coexistence is some new indication of a basic change in Soviet policy. It is no such thing. The basic concept of Soviet policy is no different today under Malenkov than it was under Stalin or under Lenin. Their idea and peaceful coexistence was discussed by Lenin and by Stalin. Their idea of peaceful coexistence is that they will allow their neighbors to exist only until they can be subverted from within or destroyed by armed aggression from without. It is the type of peaceful coexistence that they planned for us that a Thanksgiving turkey has up until a few days before our national holiday of being well fed and housed until the ax falls on its neck. Now I had a letter not many days ago from a minister of the Gospel who had been concerned by this talk of peaceful coexistence. He had known some associates of his who had suffered at Communist hands in Communist China and in some of the satellite states of eastern Europe. He sent me this quotation from the second Corinthians 6, 14: Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion has light with darkness. I think that the minister who wrote me had a much better appreciation of the meaning of communism and their type of coexistence than the sum of our so-called neutralist friends of India and others who even tonight as we are meeting here have come up with various suggestions including the admission of Communist China into the United Nations; the giving up of the islands of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese Communists; the ultimate turning over if need be of the entire island of Formosa to the Chinese Communists. I have said on the floor of the Senate of the United States and I repeat to you here tonight that in my judgment the admission of Communist China into the United Nations would be a betrayal of every principle that that organization is supposed to represent. They have not qualified in any sense of the word as being either willing or able to live up to the charter obligations of a nation devoted to international law and order. As far as I am concerned, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall oppose the admission of Communist China into that Organization.

Now the American people want peace, but we want peace with honor, and there is a vast difference between peace with honor and peace at any price. If anyone asks what the hopes and the aspirations of the American Government and the American people are in regard to living together with our neighbors, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where we have a frontier of more than 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Along that entire frontier there is not a single fort or military post of any type or character whatsoever. Our hope would be in our lifetime or that of our children other nations would be as civilized and as peaceloving as our great neighbor of Canada to the north so that not only in the Americas but in Europe and in Asia and in the Middle East people might live together as good neighbors as we live with our great neighbor of Canada to the north. But, if we are half as prudent as the men who gave us our Republic, if we are half as prudent as those who pioneered

the winning of the West, we will continue to hope and to pray for peace, but we will, like they, keep our powder dry. For we know that the age in which we find ourselves all nations are not as civilized or as peaceloving as are some of our friends to whom I have referred. I am reminded of a quotation out of one of Kipling's verses called the "Truce of the Bear." He said, "When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near; when he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise; when he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes; 'when he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer, that is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear'."

I think we must recognize that the mere fact that the Chinese Communists may accept an invitation to go to New York and discuss a cease-fire is no guaranty that while they are discussing they may not at the same time be fighting. I call your attention to the fact that when the negotiations at Panmunjom were going on some of the bitterest fighting of the Korean war took place. Why? because the Communist technique is to try to win victories and to break the morale of the opposition. When the great powers had gathered together at Geneva, out of a spirit of mercy the request had been made that they permit the evacuation of the wounded from the fortress of Dien Bien Phu. They turned it down and they insisted—while the countries were meeting—on reducing that fortress and causing a complete surrender of its garrison. So in that case the mere fact that they negotiate in no sense guarantees that they may not use the same time to cause us trouble if they can. There have been some who have suggested that perhaps, as a price of a temporary cease-fire, the Chinese Nationalist Government should be requested to give up fortress outposts of Quemoy and Matsu. This not only would be detrimental, in my judgment, to the defense of Formosa because it would open up the great harbors of Amoy and Foochou in which invasion fleets would be mobilized for the amphibious attack upon Formosa, but, in addition to that fact, it would be psychological defeat for the Republic of China, which again would be asked to give up more territory as the price of appeasement to the Chinese Communists. They will not be satisfied with any such price being paid, for they have publicly time and time again announced that their determination, regardless of our position and that of the free world, is to take Formosa by force. I do not know why it is that there are some nations in the world, who should know better, who constantly advocate that the free world retire and give up territory and give up human beings behind the Iron Curtain. I have never seen a suggestion from Mr. Nehru or any of the others that the Communist world give up some of its territory and free some of its people.

They suggest the doctrine of the two Chinas—a fatal policy. For in the first place neither the Communists or the Nationalists could possibly accept the doctrine of the two Chinas. You would not bring peace in the Pacific. You would make inevitable a conflict. Just as in the long term of history you cannot have two Germanys or two Koreas. But I am convinced that if we as a Government and we as a people only use the same courage and the same commonsense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe was divine inspiration gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve, and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Face the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of a television broadcast of Sunday, February 6, 1955:

FACE THE NATION

Guest: Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts; Ted Koop, director of public affairs, CBS, Washington, moderator; William H. Lawrence, national correspondent for the New York Times; Jack Steele, Washington correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers; William K. Hutchinson, Washington bureau chief for International News Service.

Mr. KOOP. How do you do. And welcome to Face the Nation.

Mr. MARTIN, or, as many people call you, "Mr. Republican," we are particularly happy to have you with us today on your first appearance of this kind.

You are starting your 31st year as a Member of the House of Representative from Massachusetts. Today you are the minority, that is the Republican, floor leader. You and the Democrats' SAM RAYBURN have been swapping the title of "Mr. Speaker" back and forth for more years than we care to remember.

And, as you phrased it when you turned over the gavel to him last month, it's been a case of "Off agin, on agin, gone agin, Finnegan."

Next Saturday is Lincoln's birthday, and this week the Nation will resound with traditional Republican oratory. You, as "Mr. Republican," will be in the forefront of the celebrations, and within this oratory may well lie some of the answers to success or failure of President Eisenhower's legislative program, for which you are responsible in the Democratic-controlled House.

The storm signals are already flying on such issues as the size of the Army, the Dixon-Yates contract, and, above all, the serious situation in Formosa, where the answer may well be peace or war.

Millions of Americans are seeking responsible answers to these vital issues.

To direct their questions to you, here is our panel of newsmen:

Mr. William H. Lawrence, national correspondent for the New York Times; Mr. Jack Steele, Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers; and Mr. William K. Hutchinson, Washington bureau chief of International News Service.

Now, for the first question, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, are we heading into war in the Far East?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I don't think we are. I think the Formosa resolution showed strength and was the best guaranty I know of for peace. I believe that the—Red China, they are going as far as they possibly can go without fighting, and that they are testing the American people, but I don't believe there will be any war.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, there was, of course, remarkable unanimity on this action proposed by the President and approved by the Congress; and it is, of course, the hope of everybody who passed it that it doesn't mean war. But, do you expect any challenges, do you expect some skirmishes, perhaps, if not fighting?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, no one could say with certainty that there wouldn't be some skirmishes, but I don't think that it could lead to war. Because, after all, you must realize that Red China can't make any war with the United States. Red China is a country that has no manufacturing of ammunition, and no chemical industry; half of the freight of China is transported on human backs. A nation like that couldn't wage a successful war with the United States.

Mr. HUTCHISON. Mr. Speaker, along that line, I have heard estimates in the last few days that if the United States was forced into war with Red China, the United States would win within a possible 6 hours, or possibly it might last as long as 30 days.

What are your views on that?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I am naturally conservative and don't want to go in for any extravagant claims; but I wouldn't think that Red China could hold out for 30 days.

Now, of course, they'll get, if they should get support from Communist Russia, which I doubt very much, that might keep some semblance of fighting going on, but it couldn't be much because you have to remember that Russia doesn't want to lose its existence, either. It isn't going to go into a hopeless engagement.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You don't expect Russia to intervene, then, if the United States should go——

Mr. MARTIN. No; I don't think so because the Russian people must realize what happened to Hitler and those others—the other people who have challenged the free world. I don't believe that Russia would dare risk a general engagement.

Mr. KOOP. Gentlemen, just as we came on the air I was handed this Associated Press bulletin from Tokyo that reads:

"The Red Chinese Peiping radio says the United States 7th Fleet has been conducting military provocations near Chinese waters. The broadcast, which was heard in Tokyo, says the provocations threaten the peace and security of China and the Far East. The broadcast gives no clue as to whether the Communists would interfere with the Tachen evacuation, but, the Associated Press adds, it has an ominous sound."

Mr. MARTIN. Well, every sound that comes from the Far East will be ominous from now on, and, of course, I am a newspaperman, like you folks are, and we don't underwrite a story.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. MARTIN, the agreement yesterday between Nationalist China and our Government to evacuate the Tachens focuses the spotlight on two other island groups, Quemoy and Matsu. As you know, they are just off the coast of China and they are regarded as possible stepping stones for a Communist invasion of Formosa.

Do you think we should defend Quemoy and Matsu in event the Reds try to invade them?

Mr. MARTIN. I'll answer that question, which I had anticipated, by reading a quotation from a very famous statesman. He said:

"The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Those are the words of Mr. Churchill, of England, and I believe it. I believe it is necessary—and I think, from what I understand, what I gather, it is necessary—I believe that we shouldn't permit the Red Chinese to get these islands, which would make it easier for an attack on Formosa.

If we are going to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we've got to make—defend it under the best possible conditions; and I agree with Churchill that giving another—a little more to—another little nibble, you might call it that—to the Red Chinese would not be the best way of defending Formosa.

Mr. STEELE. May I carry that one step further?

President Eisenhower has not given any public pledge to Chiang and the Nationalists that we will help them defend Quemoy and Matsu if they are invaded. At the same time,

administration spokesmen have been quoted as saying that we will.

Do you think it will be our policy, or is our policy now, to defend them in that case?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not want to anticipate what the President would do, or the State Department might make—recommend; but I do believe that it is wise not to make it too definite. I believe President Eisenhower should have all the leeway that he desires to do that which he thinks is best to establish the American viewpoint in Formosa.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Congress did give him precisely that broad authority.

Mr. MARTIN. That's why we gave it to him.

Mr. LAWRENCE. In the face of efforts to restrict it.

Mr. MARTIN. That's right.

Mr. LAWRENCE. It did not include Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. MARTIN. We wanted to give him a free hand because we can trust Mr. Eisenhower. And we know he is a soldier; he knows the dangers of war and peace, and he knows also how to protect the country; and so we did, with, I think, only three exceptions in both the House and the Senate, we gave him that authority.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, now——

Mr. KOOP. Go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up a bit an answer which you gave to Mr. Hutchinson.

You said that you thought if war came, and you don't regard it as likely, but if it came, that you didn't think the Red Chinese could hold out for 30 days.

Mr. MARTIN. No; not as the Red Chinese.

Mr. LAWRENCE. By that are you talking about a limited kind of war, or are you talking about conquering the mainland of China?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, well, what I mean is that they wouldn't be any formidable opposition after 30 days. They'd be so flattened out.

Wars can go for years, and—take the Philippine Insurrection, how many years that ran after war was practically at an end. I wouldn't say there wouldn't be some guerrilla warfare.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Where, sir? On the mainland of China?

Mr. MARTIN. Not with us, because we wouldn't send troops to the mainland.

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is what I was getting at. Are you talking about a successful defense, or resisting an attack based on these current operations, rather than a full-scale war with Red China?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, I don't think there will be a full-scale war. It's not our policy, and I don't think it will be our policy to send any troops into the mainland. We, I think, are pretty unanimous, both Democrats and Republicans, as far as that's concerned.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I just wanted to bring that back into scope, because——

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad you did, so there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. STEELE. May I follow that, one other step further: Do you think we might have to send our ground troops into Formosa, or into Quemoy or Matsu, to defend them in case of a Nationalist—or a Communist invasion of the Nationalist territory?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, of course, I am not a soldier, Jack, but I don't believe we would. I think the Chinese Nationalists have got troops enough to defend it with the aid of our Air Force and our Fleet. The Chinese Nationalists in the last 2 years have come a long way in being trained and equipped, and I think they have sufficient forces to defend themselves with our umbrella, so to speak.

Mr. KOOP. In such a case, you would not anticipate the Congress would issue a declaration of war, but would just let the President act under his new authority?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I think, Ted, we probably would let him act under his authority, but you can never safely predict what Congress would do.

Mr. STEELE. Well, in a sense, Mr. Martin, didn't Congress, in this resolution, which passed so overwhelmingly, abdicate its power to declare war to the President?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it makes a difference, Jack, what you mean by "declaring war."

There are wars that go along, and they are pretty good sized wars, too, but you make no declaration.

Mr. STEELE. But this war might be, perhaps, as violent and as vigorous and as large-scaled, perhaps, as the Korean war, without having a declaration of war.

Mr. MARTIN. We gave the President unreserved authority to defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, and he doesn't need to come to Congress, if he doesn't want to. He didn't need, I don't believe really, to ask for that authority. I think that's in his—although I understand that it was a twilight border, and he wanted to get this authority to, not only to have the united support of the people back of him, but also to clear up any doubt that might exist in anybody's mind.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, politically, you were drawing a bit of a contrast, were you not, between the handling of this one and the handling of Korea?

Mr. MARTIN. Why, there is no politics in foreign affairs, you know, Bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. There never has been, you'll excuse me; it was just an oversight on my part, because I thought there was.

But, to return to the political thing, didn't you think that was a pretty remarkable demonstration of Republican and Democratic——

Mr. MARTIN. I though it was a remarkable demonstration of unity on both the Democratic and Republican sides.

Mr. KOOP. In view of this situation in the Far East, Mr. MARTIN, what do you think of the President's proposal to cut the size of the Army?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I think it is a good suggestion, because, I'll tell you why: He is going to devote, he believes, as I understand it, in devoting more money for the atomic weapons that would keep war away from the United States.

You take, it would cost probably, if these additional soldiers were kept, about $2 million a year, which is a lot of money, and before those soldiers could ever be brought into action, in the event of war, before they could ever be brought into action, we'd have to provide the transportation to bring them over to across the water, and in that interval you could train all the men you wanted to.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, you do remember that we found ourselves caught a little short when we ran into an old-fashioned type of war in Korea.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I don't think we are in that position today.

Yes, we were caught very well short in Korea.

I remember when the Tenth Army was being chased to the sea, we didn't have but one division in the United States that could be sent, and they didn't quite dare to send that because they thought it might be needed somewhere else; but we have come a long way in the last 2 or 3 years——

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, aren't the Republicans and the administration taking a chance with this cutback in the Army, that if we should get into that kind of a situation again, the country would be pretty well up in arms about it, that there was this cutback with the possibility of that situation?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't think we'll get caught in that way.

Another thing to be thought of is this: You can collapse through spending just as well as you can collapse through assault on the battlefield, and apparently the Communist is intent on war some time or other, at least his actions would indicate that. He is only waiting for the day when he thinks he can safely attack. He knows he can't beat us now, and we've got to have—be able financially to continue that defense, so that hour he waits for will never come.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You see a whole difference, a lot of difference between fighting in Korea and fighting in China; this time there won't be any river boundary that you can't go across.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I would expect, Mister, if we got into any war, that all—we would fight to win.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. And with the atomic bomb, too, wouldn't we?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I would expect we would——

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Atomic weapons.

Mr. MARTIN. Use all the weapons within the command of the American forces to win, because we can't—if we got forced into another engagement, we can't continue these frittering wars that fritter away the strength of America and not affecting the nation that is particularly seeking to put its ideology all over the world.

Mr. STEELE. Has something the President said convinced you that that would be the case, that we would attack the Chinese mainland and bomb it?

Mr. MARTIN. No, the President has never given me any intimation of what his course would be, and of course I wouldn't tell you if he had, to be perfectly frank about it, but I am not disturbed over the strength—

You know what I think? I think we, here, not so much in America but in many of the other nations of the world, and perhaps it's logical they should be, because they are nearer to the scene, I think the free world is losing because they fear Russia.

Mr. LAWRENCE. And this is a step in the other direction, you say——

Mr. MARTIN. Let them know that we are determined that there is going to be a free world, in this country, in this world.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, again, the answer you gave Mr. Hutchinson, it seems to me, I'd like to follow up a bit.

It's been suggested in very responsible quarters that we are not talking in terms of conflict here that would involve trying to destroy China; it would simply be to try to destroy any attack upon our forces or upon any attack which might be made against Formosa or in the related areas, which includes Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. MARTIN. There isn't any question, the United States wants peace, and they are not going to be the aggressor, but we are not going to let Red China take islands that would make it so that we would be subject—that not only Japan and the Philippines and western coast of the United States would be open to attack.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, we've talked a lot in the last year about massive retaliation, the doctrine laid down by Mr. Dulles. It's been suggested in this occasion that massive retaliation is "out the window," that that is not what we are talking about.

Mr. MARTIN. We are not going to send soldiers over. I haven't got the slightest idea that we will send soldiers in millions, like we did in the other wars. No, I don't think that, I think that's out of the question. That's why it isn't necessary to have so many men on the mainland. We are building up a pretty good National Guard, we are developing reserves, we've got pretty good forces that could take care of anything that might happen, if we come under attack here.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Can I take you to politics for a moment?

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You've been, I think you have a world's record as serving as convention chairman—four times.

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know anything about the world's record; I have the record in America here.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Political party conventions, let me put it that way.

Do you intend to serve again in 1956 as chairman of the Republican Presidential Convention?

Mr. MARTIN. Bill, I'd even hate to think of it. That's the hardest job I know of. A chairman of conventions sees less of the convention than any man in the convention.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Except the reporters.

Mr. KOOP. Do you know where the Republicans are going to held their convention yet?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I do not. I suppose it will be between Chicago and Philadelphia, and, of course, Philadelphia is handicapped a bit because of its hotel situation; and, it is further handicapped by the decision of the Democrats to go to Chicago.

I don't necessarily mean that we've got to do what the Democrats do. I'd like once, if it could be brought about, for the Republicans to have their convention after the Democrats. I don't think it makes too much difference in 1956, but one year I'd like to try that just for the novelty of it.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Who are you going to nominate in 1956?

Mr. MARTIN. Personally, I believe that it will be inevitable that Mr. Eisenhower will be renominated and reelected.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Has he suggested to you that he would prefer not to run?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. He has, but I will tell you a little story:

A year and a half ago, I, in an indiscreet moment perhaps, said in Wellesley, Mass., that I thought Mr. Eisenhower would be nominated and elected. The next—2 days later—I happened to be sitting next to him in the Gridiron dinner, and he says, "I saw what you said," and he says, "What would you bet on that?"

"Well," I says, "I am not a betting man, and I wouldn't bet."

I says, "No; let me tell you, Mr. President: I know you are sincere, and I know you believe what you say, but I've been here 30 years, and I know conditions develop that make it inevitable for a President to be—to accept another nomination and be reelected. Those things work that way."

And, in my judgment, they are getting more serious than I could have anticipated at that time. You have a foreign situation so tense and so—everybody wondering what is going to happen. He's an experienced man, a man that has been through it all. You have the soldier that knows how to fight a war, if one comes, which we all pray to God won't come. So, I think it's inevitable, his nomination and election.

Mr. STEELE. You think he would yield to that pressure?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I'll tell you why I think he will.

They teach, at West Point and Annapolis, service to the country. Mr. Eisenhower has been taught to serve his country if the call comes. If the call comes, I don't think he would refuse.

Mr. STEELE. Well, despite your confidence——

Mr. MARTIN. That he could refuse.

Mr. STEELE. If he should refuse, does the Republican Party have a lot of other potential candidates around that you could go to, do you think?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I haven't even thought of any more because I felt for a certainty that he would be the one.

Mr. KOOP. Now that the Democrats are in control of Congress, how are you getting along with them?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh; I always get along very well with the Democrats.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Going back to your 30 years, Mr. Speaker, in the Congress, you came here about 1924, didn't you?

Mr. MARTIN. That's right.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. What do you think of the seniority rule for bossing Congress?

Mr. MARTIN. For what?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The seniority rule.

Mr. MARTIN. You mean in the committees——

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Committee chairmen.

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know; there are faults in that system but, frankly, I don't know of any system that is a better system.

Most any man who reaches the top of a committee has had years of service and years of study, and if he is of the caliber that he normally is, he makes a good chairman.

Now, there are exceptions. There are people that get there at the top that aren't; but I think, on the whole, that the—service is the only way you can pick a chairman.

Mr. LAWRENCE. To go back to the statement you made a while ago, that you always get along with the Democrats, I did a little research and find that on September 15, out in Louisville, Ky., 1954, when there was a campaign going on, you said this:

"Should the Democrats control the Congress, there would be a stalemate in Washington. That is something no thoughtful American wants to see happen."

Is your prophecy standing up, or——

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know yet. That will be dependent on how the Democrats take action on major parts of the Eisenhower legislation. Certainly anyone knows that it would be—that a stalemate in Congress, between the Congress and the President, is not desirable for the country. It's not a healthy picture, because you can't plan your program as you'd like to plan it. You can't put it through in the shape in which you always want it to go through.

Mr. STEELE. Do you see any signs——

Mr. MARTIN. What's that?

Mr. STEELE. Do you see any signs of this stalemate developing as yet in the action in the House?

Mr. MARTIN. Jack, we haven't started yet. We have—the committees are still working, and I think—of course, they are protesting; many Democrats were elected on the platform that they could support the President more efficiently than could the Republicans.

They haven't been given their chance. I think they will, in many instances, and I think occasionally, probably on a vital bill, the temptation, thinking of 1956, will be too much for them.

Mr. LAWRENCE. What is the—what are the big, vital bills that you see, that have just got to go through this year?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, there is the reciprocal-trade bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. The Democrats will help on that; won't they?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes——

Mr. LAWRENCE. Probably more than the majority of the Republicans?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I don't know. I'm not so sure about that, Bill. I did think so before the session started, but I have noticed that since the industry went down South, that there's been quite a parade of Alabama and Georgia and North Carolina and Louisiana people up and down to the well of the House, all preaching for protection. So, you see, you can't always anticipate what will happen.

Mr. LAWRENCE. You think somebody else's ox is being gored?

Mr. MARTIN. It's just as General Hancock said a great many years ago:

"A tariff is a local issue; when it gets so that it affects adversely any local industry, why, sometimes statesmanship vanishes."

Mr. KOOP. I believe you are making some Lincoln Day speeches down South this week, aren't you, Mr. MARTIN?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I am. I am making 3 in Florida and 1 in Texas. It happens these speeches are for the most part in—where we elected a Republican Congressman last year, the party having had a beachhold, we are going to try to see if we can expand a little bit more.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Do you expect to win more Republican seats in the South next year?

Mr. MARTIN. We've got very substantial chances.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. In Florida?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, we might get 2 more; that may amaze you, but there are 2 good chances, and of course we are not going to——

Mr. HUTCHINSON. What about Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I wouldn't say too much about Texas, although we have—if they redistrict Texas, and cut up Houston, it will take one of the Houston districts.

Mr. LAWRENCE. When is that up; is that up this year?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it can always be up, because they have a Congressman at Large in Texas, and at some time or other they get around to redistricting.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. MARTIN, I would like to get in a question——

Mr. MARTIN. And in Houston is where probably the break would come, because Houston has got more people than two Congressmen would take care of.

Mr. STEELE. I would like to get in a question that some of your colleagues consider rather touchy.

As you know, the House Judiciary Committee has reported out a bill to increase the pay of Members of Congress from $15,000 to $25,000 a year.

I wondered whether you are going to be for that; have you made up your mind?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, Jack, I don't know. It hasn't come out. I think they are going to report it out on Tuesday. I think that—I don't know what the amount will be when it finally comes out of committee, but I am frank to admit, this doesn't apply to me so much because I'm a single man and don't have the demands upon my purse that a great many other people would. But these young men, the very type of men you want in Congress, they are coming in with a couple of boys they have to send to college, and girls that they have to send to school, and they are unable to live on the salary that they get, and I think it is better for the country to pay them satisfactory salaries.

Mr. KOOP. Since you brought it up, how have you managed to remain a bachelor all this time? I can ask the question which the married men here cannot.

Mr. MARTIN. And I am glad you asked, rather than Bill.

Because I haven't had any great temptations——

Mr. KOOP. Thank you, Mr. MARTIN, for facing the Nation, and answering the questions being asked today by our panel of correspondents: Mr. William Lawrence, of the New York Times; Mr. Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers; and Mr. William K. Hutchinson, of the International News Service.

Some Lessons of Our International Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of an address which I was pleased to deliver last Thursday night in Dayton, Ohio, to the Dayton Council of World Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOME LESSONS OF OUR INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE: THE DANGER OF APPEASEMENT AND THE DANGER OF CHARACTERIZING ALL NEGOTIATION AS APPEASEMENT

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

It is a great privilege to address this outstanding organization.

I am talking tonight to leaders in this community and its surrounding area, leaders in constructive thinking on America's position in world affairs.

DAYTON: CENTER OF THE AIR AGE

It is most appropriate that we consider America's future course in this great city of Dayton whose plants and laboratories produce so vast a quantity of goods for America's security, as well as for our ever-higher standard of living.

It was a fortunate choice for America's welfare that placed the Wright-Patterson Air Base in your area.

The Wright Air Development Center spends, I understand, more than 75 percent of all funds allocated for Air Force research. It has contracts assigned to over 130 colleges and universities in addition to commercial laboratories and manufacturers. This research money is as integral a part of future American defense as is the Strategic Air Force, or the Continental Air Defense Command, or any of the other indispensable arms of United States security which depend so crucially on research.

Fortunately, the leadership of Dayton in science and invention is not a new thing. Many Daytonians who are living today knew the modest pioneer inventors, Orville and Wilbur Wright, thanks to whose efforts man first took wing, thus ushering in a new age of speed and opportunity and challenge.

One of the great inventors of our time "Boss" Kettering, chairman of the Department of Commerce's National Inventors' Council, calls Dayton home. This Council by the way, is in my judgment, one of the outstanding instrumentalities for American strength in this atomic age. Unfortunately, in the postwar years, it has practically been starved for funds, but I have hopes that we are going to see some constructive changes in that picture.

The inventive genius of America, joined with the inventive genius of other Allied Nations, is one of our greatest assets in the critical race—with the Soviet Union—for technological superiority.

"Research, research, and more research"—pure and applied research—these are the indispensable ingredients for our survival.

You, here in Dayton, a center of the Air Age—know that we of America cannot rest on previous laurels or live in an outmoded past. You know that we cannot, in this contracted world, live unto ourselves alone. You know that the free, peace-loving nations must stand together or they will fall separately.

You know that the moth-eaten arguments of the isolationists, the backward longers for a so-called "Fortress America", are as impractical as the horse and buggy in this jet age of supersonic flight.

Peace is only attainable by the strong, the forward-looking, the bold.

SEVERAL SIGNIFICANT CURRENT PROBLEMS

Now, as we look around this fast changing world of the atomic age, we see innumerable phases of foreign policy which command our attention. The most obvious phase is, of course, the crisis in the western Pacific.

But there are a great many other problems as well, less dramatic, perhaps, less urgent, but in the long run, equally or almost as significant.

I refer, for example, to the challenge of implementing the inspiring "Atoms for Peace Program," which was advanced by President Eisenhower in his unforgettable address to the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953.

I refer to the future of the U. N. itself and to possible revision of the U. N. Charter;

I refer to the vital world economic problem, to the conference in Geneva on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and other phases of the problem of increased worldwide exchange of goods and services;

I refer to the nationalist and racial and economic ferment in the huge underdeveloped regions of the earth, the scene of communism's most spectacular advances—in the recent past, and, unless we are alert and adequate, possibly in the early future.

But since time will not permit my attempting to cover these important questions, let me turn to the immediate problem in the Pacific. And then let us look at a few of the overall lessons which we have learned on the international scene.

LITTLE MARGIN FOR ERROR TODAY

Why learn these lessons?

The reason we must do so is that, as one wise man well said:

"Those who ignore the errors of history are condemned to repeat those errors."

And another thinker said:

"Every time history repeats itself, the price goes up."

Today, it is particularly important that we profit from the lessons of the past. Why? Because we have little margin for error in today's world.

In times past, diplomats or military leaders or politicians could make mistakes. The consequences of their mistakes were usually rather limited—by today's standards.

But today the results of international error, the results or miscalculations are potentially so ominous as to give pause to any thinking individual anywhere in the world.

The decisions which we make must be the right ones—and they must be timed right.

This does not mean that we can be certain in advance that they are indeed the right ones. On the contrary, almost anything we do or don't do involves risks. Invariably, our choices are between several possibilities, none of which is particularly appealing, and all of which are fraught with varying degrees of danger.

CONGRESS' FORMOSA RESOLUTION A BOLD STEP FOR PEACE

When Congress so overwhelmingly enacted the joint resolution relating to Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas, there could be no guaranty of the resolution's success in deterring war in the Pacific.

But the fact of the matter is that the alternative to our passing that resolution was an almost certain guarantee of failure.

And so, we chose a path of strength and firmness. We did so with due deliberation and in one of the great historic demonstrations of executive-legislative teamwork in our time.

Thus the test which we must continue to apply is: not which path is certain to bring us peace, but which path is relatively more likely than other paths to bring us peace.

When you are making history, as we particularly of the Atlantic community are, by our system of collective security—there is no guaranty that history will occur ultimately the way we want it.

But if you leave it to others to make history—particularly if you leave the initiative to the force of international communism—you can be quite sure that the contents of tomorrow's pages in history books will not be anything like what you and I would want them.

COMPLEX EVENTS INTERACT

Making history constructively is not easy. It cannot be done at any one place and in only one way.

The Pacific crisis is a striking illustration of how events breaking in the four corners of the world interact on one another. You cannot simply keep your eye on Matsu or Quemoy, you must keep pace with developments almost everywhere. The recent events have been breaking principally in 7 places: In the committees and on the floor of the United States Congress; in the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London; at United Nations headquarters in New York; in the Kremlin in Moscow; in Peking, headquarters of the so-called Chinese People's Republic; in Taipeh, capital of Formosa and of our brave Nationalist Chinese ally; and in the embattled Straits of Formosa themselves.

Some people, however, refuse to open up their eyes to these facts.

They refuse to acknowledge the nature of today's world is such that we cannot assume to contribute to it alone from the capital of our own country. We cannot wave a magic wand in Washington, D. C., or anywhere else in our land and have history as we would want it. We must work and consult with our friends and allies in many different places, and, yes, we must talk with our foes as well—a point to which I shall refer again later on.

Only a child believes that daddy can remake the world exactly the way the child wants it. A mature adult knows that we can and should do our part for a better world, but we must not assume that we are omnipotent or omniscient.

THE LESSON OF THE FOLLY OF APPEASEMENT

We should have learned this from the past.

But now what about those overall lessons to which I referred earlier?

The very first lesson which I shall elaborate on is the lesson of the folly of appeasement.

I need not spell out to you in detail that the world has learned to its sorrow that you can never succeed in satisfying the appetite of a criminal by offering him new victims.

In the 1930's, we witnessed the criminal aggression, step by step, nation by nation, of the Axis Powers.

In the latter part of World War II, and in the postwar years, we witnessed step by step the aggression of international communism and its enslavement of peoples.

We should know now that communism cannot be appeased. We should know that it respects only strength. We should know that surrender of one free nation to it only paves the way for the Politburo's demanding the surrender of additional free peoples. We should know that appeasement whets the Communist appetite, increases the Communists' disrespect for the free world, tempts it to further aggression.

THE DANGER OF TERMING ALL NEGOTIATION AS "APPEASEMENT"

At the same time, I want to state very clearly that there is a danger of "going overboard" and characterizing every effort to negotiate—through strength—with the Communists, as so-called appeasement.

I say that there are some quarters in the United States that seem to think that any and every reasonable effort which we make—even with utmost caution and care—in trying to sit down with the Communists and work out our problems at the United Nations or at other international conferences constitutes "appeasement."

"Appeasement" has become such an evil label that it is being used irresponsibly by some to smear reasonable diplomatic efforts.

I say that it is not appeasement to explore every possible basis for a stable, workable system of peace.

It is definitely not appeasement to talk face to face with the Red Chinese, as the

United Nations Secretary General did at Peiping, or as the United Nations has sought to do in connection with the proposed cease-fire in the Formosa Strait.

It is not the act of talking with the Communists which is appeasement. It is what might conceivably be said to the Communists at the talk which theoretically could constitute appeasement.

But I say we need have little fear that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles or U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge—two great courageous public servants—will talk appeasement. So, I say, give them a chance, give our other allied and neutralist diplomats a chance to talk, to explore, to evaluate, rather than mistakenly label every discussion as "appeasement."

There are some people, however (and I do not question their patriotic motive) who seem to want to slam the door to all east-west talk. These are the people who talk irresponsibly of "our getting out of the United Nations." These are the people who want us to proceed unilaterally, independent of our allies, independent of the U. N., in attempting now—all by ourselves—an arbitrary naval blockade of the more than 2,000 miles of Chinese coast.

Some likeminded people—the extremists in this group—even seem to want to throw ultimatums at Red China. They, of course, ignore what could happen if the ultimatum deadline were to pass.

Yes, some few of these extremists talk loosely of a "showdown now with Red China," as if we were doomed unless we were to force issues to a head within the next few days or weeks.

"PREVENTIVE WAR TALK" IS NONSENSE

Fortunately, these people are in the minority—a very tiny minority. Fortunately, the responsible leadership of the United States Government, executive and legislative, totally rejects this type of an "all-or-nothing" concept, of a "showdown now" concept.

You and I know that the concept of a so-called preventive war which is implied by a very few extremists—all of whom are out of office—is sheer madness. A preventive war actually means world war III—in all its horror. This absurd concept has gotten exactly nowhere, and will get exactly nowhere with our countrymen. Moscow, kindly note. Your propaganda to the contrary is a lie and you know it. Peace is and always has been our mission.

We are grateful that the man who occupies the White House today is a man of peace. He has seen war in all its fury and bitterness and devastation. He has seen young men under his command make the supreme sacrifice. He has seen the tragic aftermath of war in the wrecked minds and bodies in the Nation's veterans hospitals. So, Dwight D. Eisenhower is determined to maintain peace and the American people are determined to give him every possible support in his patient efforts for peace.

It will not be—it could not be—a peace of appeasement. But neither can it possibly be a peace which refuses all diplomatic face-to-face exchanges, a peace which spurns efforts at reasonable negotiation—from strength.

Now, before I leave this matter of the problem in the Pacific, let me point out that the next move is squarely up to Red China. If the Peking government and the Moscow-government desire war (which I for one doubt) then the world will recognize that the sole blame for whatever ensues is at the doorstep of Peking and Moscow.

For ourselves we desire peace, security and freedom in the Pacific and elsewhere.

We are not looking for trouble. We do not want trouble. But neither are we running away from trouble.

Now, no man here can foretell what Red China will choose to do in the Western Pacific.

My own feeling is that the strong demonstration of American unity and American toughness will deter Peking from starting a chain reaction which could lead to world war.

The long-run danger I feel is really elsewhere, as in southeast Asia. The Formosa Straits issue should not blind us to ominous events there and in other areas.

DANGER IN OTHER THEATERS

I refer, for example to the disturbing intensification of Red activity in the Republic of Indonesia. There, a Communist party, reputedly 500,000 strong is wielding increasing power.

But, that is not the only danger sign. Inflation, guerrilla war and other difficulties are also occurring in this land which, by all rights, should be a garden of Eden. But due to a combination of circumstances, Indonesia is unfortunately experiencing serious internal difficulties—which provide ideal setting for the Reds to exploit.

As for ourselves, we have nothing but good will for Indonesia. We wish naught but peace and prosperity and freedom for this vast nation which emerged less than a half-decade ago from colonial rule. It is our earnest hope that the forces of freedom in Indonesia will find it possible adequately to protect that land from Communist imperialism.

DANGER OF STRAIGHTJACKETING PRESIDENT

But now, let us turn to a second lesson of our recent past.

It is the lesson that the Chief Executive of our country must remain in a strong position to fulfill his Constitutional authority.

Our experience with respect to the Formosan crisis is a complete vindication of the position which many of us had taken last year on the controversy over treaties and executive agreements.

You will remember that in the 83d Congress, the Senate soundly rejected efforts which would have attempted seriously to limit the treatymaking powers of the President of the United States and the powers of making executive agreements.

It was our position that there are more than ample safeguards under the Constitution against any Executive abuse of power.

We contended that the nature of the atomic age is such that the President of the United States must at all times be in a position to take emergency action with our allies—action necessary for the protection of our country. Such action would always, of course, be within the framework of the Chief Executive's constitutional authority.

On the other hand, our opponents (who were then fortunately in the minority and who are today in a still smaller minority) contended the reverse. They preferred in effect to straitjacket the hands of the President. They were so fearful of abuse of power that they wanted very little power to be exercised without the most detailed congressional supervision.

I, for one, throughout the debate, had pointed out that no one could possibly foresee the many types of emergencies which might arise which might require almost split-second decision by the executive branch.

EVENTS HAVE DEBUNKED OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS

I contended that it would gravely weaken American foreign policy if the strongest Nation in the world, to whom all freemen look, were to paralyze the one man who, under the Constitution, is supposed to spearhead our foreign policy—the Chief Executive.

Now, my contentions and those of many individuals who supported this position, have been completely sustained. The opposition has been flattened—not by words, but by events—whether they realize it or not.

Many of those who wanted to tie the hands of the Chief Executive practically did a complete flip-flop once they were confronted with the Formosa crisis. Most of them said nothing about the considerable power which was being confirmed as residing in the Chief Executive's hands.

Some who did speak, emphasized that, in their judgment, there was really no alternative but to pass the joint resolution.

I want to commend these men with whom I have disagreed for recognizing the hard facts of the international situation.

I hope, however, tht they will realize that the Formosa crisis was not a rare exception. It is the sort of crisis which may recur on many occasions in many places in the future—when international communism prepares a thrust and when the Chief Executive must be in a position to parry that thrust.

THE LESSON OF "DOING THE IMPOSSIBLE"

The third and last lesson to describe within the available time—another lesson that we should have learned—is that the word "impossible" should rarely be used in foreign affairs. "Impossible" is usually used by gloomy pessimists to justify a status quo position.

Some people dismally assumed it was impossible to set up an effective United Nations Organization or to make the Marshall plan work, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or now the Southeast Asia Alliance.

They assumed that it was impossible to make the Organization of American States a dynamic entity.

As a matter of fact, every time we have tried to progress in international relations the gloom mongers have said that it "couldn't be done." But usually it has been done. We have made substantial progress. We have done the so-called impossible in all the instrumentalities which I have just mentioned.

Further, I cite to you the situation in the troubled Middle East. Certainly here is an area in which there are difficulties which would faze even the most optimistic negotiator.

Yet what do we see? We see a skilled Presidential envoy, Eric Johnston, patiently making splendid progress toward an historic Arab-Israel agreement on Jordanian and other water, long considered a so-called impossible objective.

Now, too, we see Iraq prepared to enter into an agreement with our stanch friend, Turkey, thus complementing the Turkish-Pakistani Alliance already existing in a necessary northern tier of security.

We see, too, that the so-called impossible dispute over the Suez Canal has been settled; the so-called impossible Iranian oil impasse resolved.

Now, I do not mean to imply that we can expect miracles. I do not mean to imply that all disputes are capable of quick solution, because obviously they are not. But what I do mean is that there are very few, if any, problems which do not yield to progressive change if we are willing to dedicate our abilities and our hearts to the cause.

We have seen our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, travel tirelessly around the world in the cause of peace. We have seen him time and again snatch diplomatic victory from the jaws of apparent defeat. We have seen his great spiritual faith vindicated by the resolving of apparent deadlocks and defeats, as when EDC was transformed into a Western European Union.

Let us, therefore, share the President's and Mr. Dulles' faith.

Let us give no heed to the gloom-mongers, who assume that what exists today will exist tomorrow, or that evil will grow stronger and good weaker, that tension will give way only to increased tension.

Let us have faith that we can make progress, and I say, we will indeed make progress.

CONCLUSION

It is on this sound note of faith that I should like to conclude. It is on this note of realistic optimism that I should like to

turn this subject over to your own consideration.

I began by stating that it is appropriate that here in Dayton, a great center of aeronautical research, that you and I ponder America's future in world affairs.

The essence of research is faith—faith that we can unlock the mysteries of nature, the mysteries of the atom, the mysteries of time and space.

The essence of research is courage—the courage to look forward and not backward.

You of the Dayton Council on World Affairs are similarly dedicated to blazing new trails for America.

As the scientist in his laboratory pierces the veil of the future, so you in this council seek to have us pierce the past mists of international prejudice, of blindness, of fear, and emerge into the clear light of peace and progress and faith.

Few missions could be more important for a citizen or for a public official.

Thanks for your kind attention, and good luck to you all.

Progress in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I had prepared for delivery before the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association, New York, on January 26, 1955.

Unfortunately, because of the meeting of the Senate on that day, I was unable to deliver the address personally. Instead, it was delivered by the very competent and able counsel for the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Sidney Davis, to whose work on the subcommittee I wish to pay high tribute. I have been informed by Mr. Davis that the subject matter of the address gave rise to some interesting discussions at the meeting.

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

PROGRESS IN REVERSE

(Address of Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee)

The general theme of today's session is given as Antitrust Law Progress. For reasons which I shall endeavor to make clear the title of my address is Progress in Reverse.

As the antimonopoly subcommittee pointed out in a report printed Monday, January 23: "The attention of the country has been focused more and more on the gathering momentum of the corporate merger movement. Our economy was subjected to its first great merger movement in the two decades, 1885–1905. A second significant wave of corporate mergers took place in the latter part of the 1920's * * *. Against this background, it is understandable that the third great corporate merger movement in our history, now in progress, should be the subject of widespread public, governmental, and congressional concern."

As I look at what has become of our antitrust laws in very recent years, and note the continuing increase in economic concentration and the wave of industrial mergers now taking place, I am reminded of the story of a recent atomic bomb explosion which took place down in my part of the country. After everyone had been moved to a safe distance, the bomb was set off, creating an enormous hole in the ground. The experts went to the edge of the chasm, peered over the side, and much to their astonishment saw at the bottom a human figure who slowly picked himself up off the ground and then began to climb to the top. When he reached the top, they found themselves confronted to their further amazement with a gaunt old man dressed in an old Confederate uniform and carrying an old Confederate musket. The man shook the dust from his clothes, looked into the chasm, sighed, and said, "I don't care what General Lee says, I'm giving up."

Back in 1946, as chairman of a Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, I issued a 432-page report on the then current status of the antitrust laws, entitled "United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly." In our report we stated that: "Concentration of economic power is a constantly moving, powerful force which can only be fought by an aggressive and consistent Federal legislative program, followed up by a steadily continuing active enforcement of antitrust laws by the executive agencies." After making an industry-by-industry analysis of the concentration problem and a detailed investigation of the operations and effectiveness of the antitrust agencies, we concluded that "the imprint of failure is everywhere." In retrospect, all I can say is that if "failure" was the right word for 1946, the right word for today is "calamity." The temptation is strong indeed to echo the sentiments of the old Confederate veteran.

Let us consider some of the differences between then and now. There is first the subject of appropriations, a matter of prime interest to the antitrust agencies. In the late forties and early fifties appropriations for the antitrust agencies were on the increase; between 1946 and 1953 appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission rose by 92 percent, while those for the Antitrust Division increased by 106 percent. Despite these increases the resources available to the antitrust agencies were pathetically inadequate. Yet, since 1953 the trend has been in the opposite direction; between 1953 and 1955 appropriations have fallen 3 percent for the Federal Trade Commission and 11 percent for the Antitrust Division.

Then what has become of the Government's efforts to break up existing monopolies? In 1946 we had grounds to be reasonably hopeful on this score. In its decision in the Aluminum case handed down in 1945 the special court headed by Justice Learned Hand held that 90 percent control of an industry by one company was sufficient and that 64 percent control might be sufficient to constitute a violation of the Sherman Act. In the Tobacco case decided a year later the Supreme Court stated that it welcomed the opportunity to endorse certain statements in the Aluminum case opinion, which were to the effect that a monopoly cannot be disassociated from its power, that its power cannot be dissasociated from its exercise, and that if 90 percent of the ingot producers had combined it would have constituted an unlawful monopoly. On May 31, 1946 the then Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, announced a new program designed to break up existing monopolies, stating that the times required that competition be restored "by the seldom used processes of divestiture, divorcement and dissolution." The cases instituted in the next few years against the United Shoe Machinery Co., the major meatpacking companies, the Western Electric Co. and A. T. & T., the Du Pont Co., and General Motors were all part of this program. But where is any dissolution program today?

Perhaps the bitterest pill is what has happened in the field of mergers and acquisitions. In 1946 we were striving to plug up the long-standing loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act, and we had every reason to believe that once this had been done, the Government would at long last be able to put a halt to competition-destroying mergers. Finally, after a truly incredible amount of work the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act was passed in 1950. As anyone who reads its legislative history and the accompanying committee reports must agree, this is a strong and potentially far-reaching measure. Yet what use has been made of it? According to the Federal Trade Commission 2,300 mergers and acquisitions were reported to have taken place between 1951 and 1953. If the merger movement continued at the same rate through 1954, this would mean a total of around 3,000 mergers and acquisitions since the act was passed. I am not contending for a moment that all mergers are necessarily harmful in and of themselves. Yet it is almost inconceivable that out of this total there are not at least scores which might have adverse effects upon competition. Against this wave of merger activity what have the antitrust agencies done? We find that the Federal Trade Commission has issued 3 complaints and the Department of Justice has announced in the case of 1 proposed merger that it will object, should the merger take place. No final orders of any kind have yet been issued. So the box score reads, out of probably scores of times at bat, 4 hits and no runs.

There are still other issues where the promise of yesterday is the despair of today. Take, for example, the matter of basing point pricing. In 1946 we were most hopeful that the Supreme Court would uphold the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement case and that we would at last be rid of the evil, restrictive effects of this monopolistic price-fixing device. Insofar as the Court's decision is concerned, our hopes proved to be not unfounded. But what use has been made of that magnificent legal victory? During the last 2 years accounts have appeared in the press suggesting that industries which, following the Cement decision, abandoned the basing point system, have been quietly returning to it, or to something which closely resembles it.

Or, as another example, we did not dream back in 1946 that in an antitrust case the Supreme Court would turn back the clock and make the question of subjective intent paramount above all other considerations, even the effect on competition. But that is exactly what did happen when the court handed down its decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. As a result "good faith" is now a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination. As Senators MAGNUSON, LANGER, and I said in a report dealing with this decision: "We do not think that good faith should be paramount and controlling above all else. * * * We know of no other statute, past or present, in which good faith licenses a person to violate the prohibitions of the law with impunity and without interference. The controlling consideration must be the actual effect on competition, not the question of good faith."

The crippling effects of that decision can be seen in the fact that since it was handed down, the Federal Trade Commission under its new administration has not issued a cease and desist order in a single contested Robinson-Patman Act case in which the good faith defense was offered.

I could go on to cite other illustrations of deterioration in the antitrust laws and in antitrust enforcement, but these examples should make it clear why I have entitled my address, "Progress in Reverse".

As serious as these setbacks have been, they may well be overshadowed by a new development which casts a threatening shadow over the entire structure of the antitrust laws. I am referring to the current agitation not only to revive but to extend the so-called Rule of Reason.

There is something plausible about the phrase "Rule of Reason," which, unfortunately has a peculiar semantic appeal. The semantics are also beguiling for other terms, such as "workable competition" and "taking all relevant economic factors into consideration," terms which appear with such frequency in current antitrust literature, and which seem to be the modern-day synonyms of the "Rule of Reason."

Apart from its plausible sound, the term "Rule of Reason," as every member of this audience knows, is a term of art, with a special, and to my way of thinking, deplorable meaning of its own. Since first handed down in the Standard Oil case in 1911, it has probably done more damage to the effective enforcement of the antitrust laws than all other rulings combined. Let us recall the prophetic words of Justice Harlan in his vigorous dissent in that case. Pointing out that the Supreme Court had on two previous occasions refused to accept this doctrine, Justice Harlan stated:

"But my brethren, in their wisdom, have deemed it best to pursue a different course. They have now said to those who condemn our former decision and who object to all legislative prohibitions of contracts, combinations and trusts in restraint of interstate commerce, 'You may now restrain such commerce, provided you are reasonable about it; only take care that the restraint is not undue.' * * * When Congress prohibited every contract, combination, or monopoly, in restraint of commerce, it prescribed a simple, definite rule that all could understand and which could be easily applied by everyone wishing to obey the law, and not to conduct their business in violation of the law. But now, it is to be feared, we are to have, in cases without number, the constantly recurring inquiry—difficult to solve by proof—whether the particular contract, combination, or trust involved is or is not an 'unreasonable' or 'undue' restraint of trade." (221 U. S. 102, 103 emphasis in original.)

Before this audience I need not dwell upon the catastrophic effects of the introduction of this doctrine into the enforcement of the Sherman Act, particularly with respect to dissolution cases. Against the known record of the carnage which it has wrought, it is hard to realize that this doctrine is not only being strongly urged as the standard of lawfulness, but is apparently receiving increasing acceptance.

It may have been forgotten in some quarters, but one of the principal reasons behind the enactment of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act in 1914 was the desire of Congress to pass legislation to which the "rule of reason" would not be applicable. The legislative history leaves no room for doubt on this issue. Thus the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in its report of February 26, 1913 on what became the Federal Trade Commission Act recognized that the Sherman Act had become subject to the "rule of reason," and stated that because of that very fact new legislation was needed to which this doctrine would not apply. Referring to the majority decision in the Standard Oil case, the committee said:

"The fair conclusion is that it is now the settled doctrine of the Supreme Court that only undue or unreasonable restraints of trade are made unlawful by the Sherman Antitrust Act, and that in each instance it is for the Court to determine whether the established restraint of trade is a due restraint or an undue restraint."

Then after making it clear that it had "full confidence" in the "integrity, intelligence and patriotism" of the Supreme Court, the committee went on to state that—

"It is unwilling to repose in that court or any other court, the vast and undefined power which it must exercise in the administration of the statute under the rule which it has promulgated. It substitutes the court in the place of Congress, for whenever the rule is invoked the court does not administer the law, but makes the law. If it continues in force, the Federal courts will, so far as restraint of trade is concerned, make a common law for the United States just as the English courts have made a common law for England.

"The people of this country will not permit the courts to declare a policy for them with respect to this subject. * * * It is inconceivable that in a country governed by a written Constitution and statute law the courts can be permitted to test each restraint of trade by the economic standard which the individual members of the court may happen to approve." (62d Cong., 3d sess., S. Rept. No. 1326, p. 10.)

It is gratifying for me to note that Judge Medina, speaking for the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, made the same interpretation of Congressional intent in his recent decision in the Dictograph case. This case involves exclusive dealing contracts which, the court held, were in violation of section 3 of the Clayton Act. In discussing the legislative history of this section Judge Medina stated:

"With respect to exclusive-dealing contracts, the evident impulsion toward including a specific proscriptive provision was the desire on the part of the Congress to overrule by legislation an earlier decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals * * * upholding, as not violative of the Sherman Act, what was tantamount to the refusal, by a leading producer of chewing tobacco, to sell to a dealer because the dealer would not agree to deal exclusively in the seller's products * * * It was to make sure that the Sherman Act 'rule of reason' would not be employed to validate further transactions of such a patently undesirable nature that the proscriptive provision under discussion was thought necessary. It is hardly likely that the insertion of the qualifying phrase, 'where the effect * * * may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly,' was intended to reinstate the same Sherman Act tests which had, at that very time, been determined to be inadequate." (*Dictograph Products Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, October term, 1954.)

Frankly I have become increasingly distressed by signs that the Federal Trade Commission, is reading the "Rule of Reason" into parts of the law where it is no longer applied by the Supreme Court, or what is worse, reading it into other parts of the law where Congress never intended it to apply. The essential question is whether the requirements now being imposed as to the amount and type of evidence constitutes in effect the adoption of the "Rule of Reason." I am concerned particularly with recent actions by the Federal Trade Commission in requiring extensive and perhaps unnecessary bodies of evidence.

The best description of what I am worried about appears in the November 1954 issue of Fortune magazine, entitled "The Urge to Merge." Referring to the Department of Justice's case against the Du Pont Co. for monopolizing the cellophane industry, the article states that, "Unless the decision is reversed by the Supreme Court, the case appears to have shifted antitrust enforcement policy back to the 'rule of reason' of the 1920's." The article then goes on to say:

"Essentially, this means that management, using its own data, can itself decide how much of a market it can exploit safely through a merger without inviting an antitrust action. Economists and statisticians, in other words, take the place of lawyers in helping management reach decisions of this kind. How good this is for the economy and how much it will lessen competition only the future will tell. Rule-of-reason enforcement has undoubtedly slowed down enforcement of antitrust; neither the Department of Justice nor the Federal Trade Commission has the budget or trained personnel to watch the markets constantly and move against a company or a group of them trying to rig one. The threat of antitrust action probably will stop flagrant attempts to minimize competition, but it need not stop a merger if management's conception of the market position after merger is sound in antitrust terms. If Eugene Grace, for example, believes that the proposed merger of Bethlehem and Youngstown will strengthen competition in the steel industry (and many outsiders believe it will), chances are the merger will go through."

I realize, of course, that no journal speaks officially for the administration. At the same time, however, Fortune is a most reputable organ which, before publishing such an article, could certainly be expected to have familiarized itself with the administration's views. Moreover, the emphasis upon the rule of reason as the test of what is sound in antitrust terms is, of course, wholly in keeping with the general philosophy of Professor Oppenheim who, after all, is the cochairman of the Attorney General's committee on antitrust law revision. If this passage represents anything approaching an accurate reflection of the administration's views, the area of difference between the administration's interpretation of congressional intent and the interpretation made by those of us in Congress who sponsored and supported the measure is rather wide.

There is a possible historical parallel here which is worth noting. Several years before the Supreme Court established the "rule of reason" in its decision in the Standard Oil case, a bill was introduced to accomplish this same result through legislation. On behalf of the Senate Judiciary Committee Senator Nelson in 1909 reported adversely on the bill and it subsequently died. In his report Senator Nelson stated:

"The injection of the rule of reasonableness or unreasonableness would lead to the greatest variableness and uncertainty in the enforcement of the law. The defense of reasonable restraint would be made in every case and there would be as many rules of reasonableness as cases, courts and juries. A court or jury in Ohio might find a given agreement or combination reasonable, while a court and jury in Wisconsin might find the same agreement and combination unreasonable * * * To amend the Antitrust Act, as suggested by this bill, would be to entirely emasculate it, and for all practical purposes render it nugatory as a remedial statute." (Cited and quoted in 221 U. S. 96, 97.)

What Congress refused to enact in 1909, the Supreme Court read into the law in 1911. The Federal Trade Commission may be sorely tempted to emulate the Supreme Court of 45 years ago. It may be sorely tempted, but I trust it will not do so.

The daily press tells us that American business is today combining, uniting, grouping and regrouping, merging, remerging and merging again. Competition as a way of life is under constant attack and small, independent business is on the decline. I, therefore, think it is of the utmost importance that Congress develop facts concerning the scope of the merger movement, the extent and strength of the thrust toward monopoly, and the decline of competition in our economic life.

Congress needs to make an examination into the rise of new financial and industrial oligarchies, and highly integrated forms of business and management. Congress needs to examine business practices aimed at limiting or eliminating competition. The investigation which our subcommittee conducted of monopoly in the power industry should be continued and broadened and deepened, so that the Congress may be fully informed as to the extent of monopolistic abuses which threaten a repetition of the

Insull-Hopson scandal. We need a full-scale inquiry into the growth of monopoly, its withering effects upon the small business of this country, and its effect upon our free competitive economy.

Perhaps new and better tools and policies of enforcement are called for. Meanwhile, it is important that the executive branch make the best use possible of the tools now at its disposal. Congress meanwhile must concern itself not only with its important policymaking function in the field of monopoly but also with enforcement of these policies by the executive branch of the Government.

I can emphasize the necessity for this no better than by reading to you the concluding paragraph of the report published Monday by our subcommittee:

"The danger to the country from monopoly run wild is written in large letters across the recent economic and political history of this Nation. The committee therefore feels that it cannot overstate the imperative necessity for the Congress to deal with this issue immediately."

Thank you.

Kansas, the 34th Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1861, the 34th star was added to our flag, denoting the admission of the Territory of Kansas as a State in the Union.

In keeping with the birthday spirit, I gave a radio talk over KCMO, Kansas City, Mo., the subject of which was Kansas.

That speech, substantially as given, follows:

Inasmuch as January 29 is the 94th birthday of the State of Kansas, a day that will be celebrated all over the Nation, and especially at Topeka, it seems fitting and proper that, as a native Kansan, and as a Representative in Congress from Kansas, I should make Kansas the subject of my initial broadcast.

Did you ever notice what happens when you meet somebody from Texas? The first thing they do is start bragging about Texas—it's Texas this—Texas that. Let's admit, right off of the bat, that Texas is a big State.

Now Texas does raise a lot of cattle, but that beef wouldn't be fit to eat if it wasn't fed on that fine blue stem grass of the Kansas Flint Hills, and if it wasn't finished off with Kansas—yes, Missouri—corn in Kansas and Missouri feed lots.

Take away the military installations in Texas—yes, and its oil wells—well, you guess what would happen.

Kansas and Kansans have lots of things to be proud of, and to rightfully boast about. We have even more right to brag than Texans, and we should do it every chance we get.

Kansas is roughly 200 miles wide and 400 long; a little better than 80,000 square miles. That's about one-third the size of Texas.

In those 80,000 square miles, we have many natural resources, for which we claim no credit. The Lord provided those. But they are there. There's lots of oil, although not as much as Texas. There's natural gas—and there's coal. Kansas is the greatest supplier of fuel and energy in the United States.

When you speak of gold, most of us think of Alaska, or perhaps, Cripple Creek, Colo., and gold means great wealth. We don't mine any gold in Kansas, but in mineral resources, Kansas produces five times as much as Alaska with its gold, and our mineral production far exceeds the minerals produced in the reputedly mineral rich States of the Rocky Mountains.

Salt is a commonly accepted household item here, but in many countries I have visited it is a luxury selling for as much as $10 a pound. Kansas has enough salt to last the entire world thousands of years.

In less spectacular quantities, Kansas produces lead, zinc, gypsum, clays, cement, chalk, helium, and an enviable amount of fine sand and gravel.

Far from being the drab, ugly, flat State many uninformed writers have pictured it, Kansas is full of scenic beauty, starting with the rolling hills and the valley of the Marais des Cygne on out to prehistoric grounds and the Rock Canyons of Ellsworth which vie, in beauty, with some of the highly advertised national parks.

The heart of America, the very center of the United States, Kansas is crossed and recrossed by 13 railroads, 4 of which are transcontinental lines. Several major airlines cross the State; and talking of flying, Kansas has more "flying farmers" than any State in the Union. Even though Texas is three times as big as Kansas, Kansas has far more miles of improved highways than Texas. In fact, Kansas is second, in the United States, in highway mileage.

Although visited by droughts at times, we are not as hard hit by them as many other States. Kansas is a commercial corn-growing State. Its output of soybeans is prodigious and everybody knows that Kansas grows one-fifth of all the wheat grown in this country.

Kansas raises lots of high-grade beef, but what is not generally known is that turkey raising is a multi-million dollar business in Kansas, and that Kansas ranks among the top eight States in poultry and egg production.

While 90 percent of our area is farms, Kansas is growing rapidly as an industrial State. More than 3,000 factories turn out thousands of various industrial items.

Much of the cement going into our new homes, highways, and buildings comes from Kansas plants like those at Bonner Springs, Iola, and Humboldt.

The automobile tire plant at Topeka and the huge oil refineries like the Phillips plant in Kansas City, Kans., keep the Nation's wheels of commerce turning.

Better crops are grown as the result of the chemical plants such as the Co-op plant at Lawrence, and Spencer, and Pittsburg.

Strange as it may seem and sound, during World War II, Kansas had 2 shipyards in operation, 1 at Leavenworth and 1, the Darby plant on Kaw Point in Kansas City, Kans. In these yards were built landing craft used in the beachhead operations at Omaha Beach, Anzio, and Iwo Jima.

In Kansas City, Kans., B-25 Mitchell bombers were turned out by the hundreds, while at Wichita, Boeing made the famous B-29. Today the Kansas City, Kans., plant is turning out F-84-F's and just recently Boeing, at Wichita, turned out its 1,000th B-47 jet bomber and is now producing the even bigger B-52.

At Sunflower, millions of pounds of explosives were produced, and at Parsons countless thousands of bombs were loaded and sent on their way to bring victory.

Tell your Texas friends to come to Kansas and we'll show them the biggest grain elevator in the world—right in Kansas City, Kans.; the biggest natural cold storage cave at Bonner Springs; and down by Pleasanton they'll see the biggest electric shovel in the world which digs coal almost by the carload. Yes, we have big things in Kansas, too.

These are only a few of the industrial contributions Kansas makes in war or peace—a production so great that Kansas in dollar volume was 5th in the 48 in World War II.

With all of the vast production and the problems involved, Kansas had the best labor record of all, with little or no loss of time or war material from strikes.

Kansas has an amazingly interesting historical background. Even though we have no Alamo, our future was determined by hard-riding, hard-fighting men skilled in handling the six-guns and Sharp's rifles.

Our earliest recorded history goes back to Coronado's conquest in 1541—60 years before Pocahontas saved John Smith's neck.

Kansas is dotted with historical sites reminiscent of the gold rush, and the Santa Fe Trail, Indian wars, the Pony Express, border warfare, cow towns, along the Chisholm Trail, Dodge City, Abilene.

At the mouth of the Kaw, Lewis and Clark started their famous expedition.

Close at home is the Shawnee Indian Mission. Osawatomie is the site of John Brown's cabin. Then, too, there is Trading Post, scene of ruffian border war, Lawrence, and Quantrill's raid, with the reciprocating raids into Missouri by Jayhawkers.

Council Grove was the site of Indian treaties. At Fort Scott we still have the old pre-Civil War barracks and blockhouse.

All of these are part of the great heritage of Kansas. However, the greatest asset of our State is its people.

Today the No. 1 Kansan is President Eisenhower—but we have had other great men. Charles Curtis, proud of his Indian blood, was Vice President. We have given the Nation outstanding men and women in all fields of activity.

One of the long-time best sellers, "In His Steps" was written by Rev. Charles Sheldon.

The literary world recognizes such men as William Allen White and his son young Bill; yes, and John J. Ingalls, President pro tempore of the United States Senate and author of Ironquill. Albert T. Reid, Gene Howe, and Arthur Capper graced the news field, along with today's Ben Hibbs, of the Saturday Evening Post, and Ernest K. Lindley, and last but by no means least is the beloved Merle Thorpe.

In the broadcasting field a Kansan's voice is ranked best, John Cameron Swayze, and close behind him is a Kansas University graduate, Richard Harkness.

Whenever one thinks of sports he thinks of Jess Willard, heavyweight champion, and the "Big Train" Walter Johnson in baseball, and the epitome of determination and grit, the great runner, Glenn Cunningham, and in more recent years the all-American football star, Ray Evans.

In the field of adventure two Kansas women are at the top of the list, Mrs. Osa Johnson, explorer, and Amelia Earhart, the lost aviatrix.

When it comes to beauty and grace Kansans can be proud of little Donna Attwood, star of Ice Capades.

Bradbury Thompson, of Topeka, art director of Madamoiselle and Living, was recently declared the art editor of the year.

Walter Beech in aviation history; George Washington Carver in science and racial progress; yes, ever so many others, including the top men in industry, science, and business throughout the Nation.

That Kansas should have produced such men is no accident. Their background, training, and surroundings were exceptional. Kansas is proud of its churches and schools. Despite the fact that Massachusetts has Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Kansas, second in the United States, is far above the Bay State in literacy, and Kansas has the largest number of college students per thousand of any State in the Union.

In all of our wars, Kansas has made big contributions. Missouri had her Pershing. Kansas had her Funston. Kansans have won all sorts of awards from the Congressional Medal on down. In World War I, Kansas had the smallest number of men rejected for military service—which demonstrates the physical sturdiness of her sons. In World War II, with many Kansans having settled there, Oregon pushed us into second place. But with the coming of the Korean war, Kansas again had the fewest rejections. Yet Texas has the audacity to brag of the hardiness of her menfolk.

Kansas has the highest percentage of native-born residents of any of the States. And while we think of New York as a wealthy State, the per capita wealth of Kansas is greater than that of New York.

From what I have said you may well guess that I am proud of Kansas and proud to be a Kansan. I am.

We have more than our share of good things—and fewer of the bad than many have claimed. We have had far fewer cyclones than many of the southern States, so stories about Kansas being a cyclone State are libelous. We have had our share of hard times, too. Our motto—Ad astra per aspira—"To the stars through difficulty" is particularly appropriate. Those courageous ancestors of ours, who left comforts behind, came to Kansas and carved out a great future for us, did face hardships and difficulties. Their courage, stamina, and faith brought them through. We, their children, can see the bright stars of the future.

With this great history, it is perfectly natural that on Kansas Day, Kansans should gather together and celebrate their State's birthday.

These Kansas Day celebrations were started nearly 75 years ago by about 100 men headed by a great threesome of newspaper fame, William Allen White, Ewing Herbert, and Charles Harger, the sole survivor of that famous trio.

For nearly fourscore years these meetings have taken place with the activities centered around Topeka.

Soon we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of Kansas statehood, just as we have celebrated the Territorial Centennial this past year.

That century has marked the development of God-given natural resources by resourceful courageous Kansans.

The story of that century is as gripping as fiction, as colorful as a modern-day western. The cast of characters is as varied as can be imagined: Indians and white men, saints and sinners, lawmakers and lawbreakers, laborers and financiers, teachers and preachers. Long-remembered names such as Billy the Kid, Bat Masterson, Kit Carson, Lincoln and Douglas and their great debates, Carrie Nation, Horace Greeley, Walt Mason, all left their mark as the story of Kansas unfolds.

The scenes were as varied as the characters; tepees and sodhouses, churches and saloons, courthouses and jails, factories and farms, battlefields, cradles, and graves.

The pages of that century of history are punctuated by spurting six guns, splattered with blood of border warfare, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, two World Wars, and Korea.

That hundred years has served to try Kansas and Kansans. They have been tested; they've been found true, loyal, and courageous.

Here, indeed, and in fact, is the heart of America.

And in closing, may I read the product of the skilled pen of Charles Harger, what has been called the Kansan's Creed:

"We believe in Kansas, in the glory of her prairies, in the richness of her soil, in the beauty of her skies, and in the healthfulness of her climate.

"We believe in the Kansas people, in their sturdy faith, and abounding enthusiasm; in their patriotism and their fidelity to the good things of civilization; in their respect for law and their love of justice; in their courage and zeal; in their independence; and in their devotion to uplifting influences in education and religion.

"We believe in Kansas institutions; in the Kansas language and in Kansas ideals; in her uprightness in society; and in her demands that honor, sobriety, and respect be maintained in public and private life; in her marvelous productiveness; and in her wonderful future."

Yes, I am a Kansan. I am proud of it. If you, too, are a Kansan, I trust that you join me in that pride. If you are not a Kansan, I hope you feel that this pride is justified.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, trusting only in Thy mercy, bringing nothing in our hands—our selfish hands which we confess too often yield to the temptation to grasp so many fleeting baubles—we wait in contrition at this shrine of grace for Thy benediction. We would face whatever the day may bring in the confidence of Thy guidance, in the gladness of Thy service, and in the solemn realization that we are indeed our brother's keepers.

May the great causes that will mold the future of human life on this planet into the pattern of Thy desire and design, that will heal the hurts of this sorely wounded world, that will create good will and usher in abiding peace, challenge the best that is in us and gain the supreme allegiance of our love and labor as we serve our brief day in these fields of time. We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 8, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Civil Defense Contributions Program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO NAVAHO TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third semiannual report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most