Service plane in the mid-Atlantic in January.

Finally, there are the Treasury's newest duties, those given the Secretary last year for administering the Federal Facilities Corporation, the liquidation of the RFC, and various defense lending programs.

The Federal Facilities Corporation has been conducting the Government's program for the production and sale of synthetic rubber and refined tin. It is currently expected that the synthetic-rubber-producing facilities will soon be sold to private interests, and that production of tin will be discontinued at the close of the current fiscal year.

The liquidation of the RFC is being carried out as expeditiously as possible under the general policy of securing the highest possible return on the funds invested in RFC assets without creating undue hardships for those indebted to the Corporation.

The programs for defense production and civil-defense lending are being carried on at the minimum levels required under present international and military conditions. Loans previously made under these programs are being placed in the hands of private financial institutions as rapidly as possible.

These many bureaus, divisions, offices, and services add up to the Treasury Department, an efficient organization carrying out functions vital to the operations of our Government. The Treasury has for many years been a well-run Department staffed with many able career people. It was not overstaffed so much under the past administration as some other departments, and the opportunity for savings was not so great. Nevertheless, in the last 2 years we have been able to make significant improvements in the management of this Department. While the total civilian employment of the Treasury is down from almost 88,000 to about 79,000—a drop of 9,000 or 10 percent—the enforcement activities have been strengthened by emphasizing more productive work, improving methods, and cutting out waste wherever we can find it.

In connection with specific activities, I have given some illustrations of savings from management improvements. The aggregate savings for the whole Department were over $12 million in fiscal 1953, and well over $20 million in fiscal 1954. The 1952 figure was $4 million and the highest previous year for which we have figures was $8 million in 1951.

In closing, I would like to say that I am proud to be a member of the Eisenhower administration and the Treasury team. I also want to stress the loyalty, hard work, and devoted service of the Department's employees. We are all striving to give the American people a fair, honest, and efficient Government, in which they will have confidence. Such confidence is basic to our policies of providing stability in the value of the dollar and a solid basis for economic growth.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

Lord of all being, whose glory flames from sun and star and on the awakening earth: With a freshened earth washed by Thy gentle rain, we bring to Thee our parched souls that they may be restored by Thy plenteous mercy which follows us all the days of our life.

Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the cleansed hearts of men, out of which are the issues of life, we pray for ourselves. Purify our desires and motives by Thy grace. Feed our minds with Thy truth. Fortify our spirits by Thy might. Guide our feet into Thy paths of truth and justice and righteousness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 15, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 942) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 100. An act to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 103. An act to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies;

H. R. 473. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 607. An act to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years;

H. R. 780. An act to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses;

H. R. 869. An act for the relief of David Del Guidice;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young;

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 996. An act for the relief of Robert Francis Symons;

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of Clyde M. Litton;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello;

H. R. 1116. An act for the relief of Paul Bernstein;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1134. An act for the relief of Sullivan Construction Co.;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;

H. R. 1171. An act for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1189. An act for the relief of William H. Barney;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas;

H. R. 1401. An act for the relief of Ewing Choat;

H. R. 1404. An act for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of J. B. Phipps;

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 1426. An act for the relief of George S. Ridner;

H. R. 1440. An act for the relief of Ciro Picardi;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Constantine Nitsas;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1664. An act for the relief of Charles Chan;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1719. An act for the relief of William V. Dobbins;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1801. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Vito Magistrade;

H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 1921. An act for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.;

H. R. 1941. An act for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased;

H. R. 1943. An act for the relief of John G. Zeros;

H. R. 1953. An act for the relief of Virginia Hell;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 1965. An act for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;

H. R. 1995. An act for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan;

H. R. 2057. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2316. An act for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Guy H. Davant;

H. R. 2456. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell;

H. R. 2486. A act for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky;

H. R. 2529. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 2760. An act for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice;

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2936. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 3031. An act for the relief of Paul Nelson;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 3178. An act for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport;

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer;

H. R. 3281. An act for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of Joe Kawakami;

H. R. 3362. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante;

H. R. 3364. An act for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher;

H. R. 3365. An act for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 3367. An act for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn and others;

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg;

H. R. 3512. An act for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn;

H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4044. An act for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others;

H. R. 4046. An act to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4191. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn;

H. R. 4288. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 4320. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley;

H. R. 4367. An act to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acres tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California; and

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.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 100. An act to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 103. An act to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies;

H. R. 473. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 607. An act to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years;

H. R. 1801. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4046. An act to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4367. An act to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 780. An act to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses;

H. R. 869. An act for the relief of David Del Guidice;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young;

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 996. An act for the relief of Robert Francis Symons;

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of Clyde M. Litton;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello;

H. R. 1116. An act for the relief of Paul Bernstein;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1134. An act for the relief of Sullivan Construction Co.;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;

H. R. 1171. An act for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1189. An act for the relief of William H. Barney;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas;

H. R. 1401. An act for the relief of Ewing Choat;

H. R. 1404. An act for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of J. B. Phipps;

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 1426. An act for the relief of George S. Ridner;

H. R. 1440. An act for the relief of Ciro Picardi;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Constantine Nitsas;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1664. An act for the relief of Charles Chan;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1719. An act for the relief of William V. Dobbins;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Vito Magistrade;

H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 1921. An act for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.;

H. R. 1941. An act for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased;

H. R. 1943. An act for the relief of John G. Zeros;

H. R. 1953. An act for the relief of Virginia Hell;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 1965. An act for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;

H. R. 2057. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2316. An act for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Guy H. Davant;

H. R. 2456. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell;

H. R. 2486. An act for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky;

H. R. 2529. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 2760. An act for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice;

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2936. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 3031. An act for the relief of Paul Nelson;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 3178. An act for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport;

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer;

H. R. 3281. An act for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of Joe Kawakami;

H. R. 3362. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante;

H. R. 3364. An act for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher;

H. R. 3365. An act for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 3367. An act for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn and others;

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg;

H. R. 3512. An act for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn;

H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4044. An act for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others;

H. R. 4191. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn;

H. R. 4288. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 4320. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley; and

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.

H. R. 1995. An act for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Thursday and Friday of this week the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will conduct hearings in Atlanta, Ga., and Miami, Fla. Members of the subcommittee who will attend these hearings are the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself.

I ask unanimous consent that permission be granted members of the subcommittee to be absent from the Senate on Thursday and Friday of this week.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have leave of the Senate to be absent from my duties as a Senator until after the session of next Tuesday, in order that I may attend hearings of Senate committees in Georgia, on tomorrow, and in my State of Florida on Friday and on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask leave of the Senate to be absent from the Senate on Friday of this week, in order that I may attend certain Army demonstrations at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, at Aberdeen, Md.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been invited, along with the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and other Senators, to go to Aberdeen, Md., on Friday to view the new armed vehicles and other equipment. I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Friday for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Friday next in order to address a maritime gathering in Seattle, Wash.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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 COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of January 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees," for the fiscal year 1955, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant

to law, the annual report of that Board, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended, in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States by including probation officers of United States district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the United States Flag Committee, Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y., signed by H. Joseph Mahoney, legislative secretary, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution H-2

"Concurrent resolution urging Congress and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to establish tribal courts or courts of Indian offenses for the Fort Totten Indian Reservation

"Whereas the Federal Government has withdrawn from law-enforcement activities upon the Fort Totten Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota has ruled that this State has no jurisdiction over such Indian lands; and

"Whereas there is presently no provision for any law enforcement whatsoever upon the Fort Totten Indian Reservation except for the 10 major crimes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the legislative assembly hereby urges and requests the Congress and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide for the establishment of tribal courts or courts of Indian offenses at Fort Totten Indian Reservation in order to maintain law and order on such Indian lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

"House Concurrent Resolution Q-1

"Concurrent resolution relating to law enforcement problems upon Indian reservations

"Whereas Public Law 280 has authorized the various States of the Union, including North Dakota, to assume criminal and civil jurisdiction in Indian country within their boundaries by appropriate resolutions or constitutional amendments; and

"Whereas no provision is now made whereby the Federal Government will reimburse States and local political subdivisions for the necessary expenditures upon the assumption of such jurisdiction over territory under the absolute control of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota is desirous of seeing that Indian people within its boundaries receive the same impartial protection of effective law enforcement as is enjoyed by non-Indian residents; and

"Whereas a recent investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has disclosed and made public the deplorable lack of effective law enforcement in said Indian country as the same affects juveniles and adults, residents of said Indian country; and

"Whereas the solution of said problem and the improvement of the condition of said residents of said Indian country requires that adequate provisions be made for the reimbursement of State and political subdivisions before the assumption of said jurisdiction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, (the Senate concurring therein) That the North Dakota delegation in Congress, working with the delegations of other States having Indian populations, is hereby urged and requested to provide a means whereby it will be feasible for the State of North Dakota to offer its facilities for the correction of the presently existing deplorable conditions. That the legislative research committee is hereby authorized and directed to study such matters and to appoint a subcommittee to give detailed consideration to the financial aspects of such readjustment of historic responsibility and such subcommittee is hereby authorized to confer with the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in arriving at an equitable solution to such problems, and the legislative research committee is further directed, upon the completion of such study and said conferences, to publish its findings and recommendations, and to make its report to the Thirty-Fifth Legislative Assembly in such form as it may deem expedient; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the North Dakota Congressional delegation, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to all other persons interested in said matter.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

WITHDRAWAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON COMPLETION OF GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the County Commissioners of Clay County, the Public Service Department of the City of Moorhead, and the board of directors of the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce requesting the Congress of the United States to withdraw all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to operate at the maximum operating pool level of 1,850 feet. The resolution also requests the appropriation of sufficient funds to enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project at an efficient rate in procurement of real estate, planning, and construction of the project so that all potential benefits can be realized. I request that this petition be appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, authorized the construction of the Garrison Dam in North Dakota to provide urgently needed flood protection, for diversion to the James, Sheyenne, and Souris Rivers for the irrigation of over 1,000,000 acres of land in North and South Dakota, for production of hydroelectric power for rural electrification, municipal and industrial use, for municipal and industrial water supplies, stabilization of streamflows for stream-pollution abatement, and improved downstream navigation, for restoration of lakes, and for recreation and fish and wildlife conservation and propagation and other multiple benefits; and

Whereas through the coordinated efforts of the Corps of Engineers, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission and the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee it has been determined that a maximum operating pool level for the Garrison Reservoir of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) is the most economical and will insure a realization of the maximum potential benefits by meeting all requirements of water users and, as a result of this determination, the Corps of Engineers have proceeded to plan, design, and construct the facilities for the project for operation at this pool level; and

Whereas adequate measures have been incorporated in the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project plan and designs for the protection of the city of Williston, the Lewis and Clark, and Buford-Trenton irrigation projects from any adverse effects caused by reservoir operation at the maximum pool level of 1,850 feet so that there will not be any interference with the normal use of these areas; and

Whereas, the operating pool level of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) of the Garrison Dam project will insure the maximum production of hydroelectric power for rural electrification, irrigation, municipal, and industrial use; that, according to studies by the Federal Power Commission, the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and others, will be needed by these users as soon as it is available; and

Whereas the additional power revenues that would be earned by the power facilities at Garrison Dam when the reservoir for that project is operated at a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,850 feet as compared to a lower level are needed to permit the maximum development of irrigation as authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the construction of main stem dams on the Missouri River will permit the construction and enhance the feasibility of small irrigation projects below and adjacent to these reservoirs because of the elimination of bank erosion, reduced power costs, and flood protection afforded to the lands involved; and

Whereas the diversion of water from the Missouri River into central and eastern North Dakota for irrigation, municipal water supplies, restoration of lakes, stream-pollution abatement, and other purposes has been advocated by many people in North Dakota for the past 70 years and a plan under investigation by the United States Bureau of Reclamation to accomplish this diversion by utilizing the waters stored in the Garrison Reservoir has been determined feasible and can be most efficiently accomplished if the

Garrison Reservoir is operated at the 1,850-foot pool level; and

Whereas any reduction of the operating pool level of Garrison Reservoir will be a waste of its capacity to store reserve water for irrigation, municipal water supply, hydroelectric power production, and other uses during periods of drought; and

Whereas the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project is now over 80-percent complete and to curtail progress so as to prevent or delay its full utilization by restricting the operation of the reservoir at an elevation below 1,850 feet for flood protection, irrigation, hydroelectric power production and other multiple uses would result in major losses of potential benefits to this locality, the people of North Dakota and the entire Missouri Basin, and would not be consistant with good conservation practices; and

Whereas a definite need exists for the complete utilization of water from the Garrison Reservoir in central and eastern North Dakota as provided by the Garrison Diversion plan to provide for the continued prosperity and economic expansion of North Dakota through the irrigation of large areas which can be accomplished most efficiently and economically if the Garrison Reservoir is operated at a maximum normal pool elevation of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level):

Whereas the city of Moorhead, Minn., has been assured of a firm power commitment from electricity generated at the Garrison Dam and that negotiations are now under way for the construction of a transmission line to transport this electrical energy to Moorhead and that there would be a definite possibility that any reduction in the pool level below the 1,850-foot level now authorized would seriously affect the amount of electrical energy that would be made available to this area and that the diversion of water to the central and eastern portions of North Dakota will have a definite bearing upon the future economy of this community; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce, Moorhead, Minn., That the senators and congressmen of the State of Minnesota do hereby petition and request the Congress of the United States to withdraw all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to operate at the maximum operating pool level of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level), and to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project at an efficient rate in procurement of real estate, planning, and construction of the project so that all potential benefits can be realized; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to: Edward J. Thye, Senator from the State of Minnesota; Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator from the State of Minnesota; Mrs. Coya Knutson, Congresswoman, Ninth District, State of Minnesota, and Orville L. Freeman, Governor of the State of Minnesota.

CRUSADE FOR WORLD ORDER—CONCLUSIONS OF COUNCIL OF BISHOPS OF METHODIST CHURCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusions from various discussions in the Crusade for World Order, led by the council of bishops of the Methodist Church, and intended to promote world peace, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

The conclusions presented by Mr. HUMPHREY were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILLWATER, MINN., *March 11, 1955.*

Recently our church took part in the Crusade for World Order, led by the council of bishops of the Methodist Church, and intended to promote world peace.

From the discussions on various subjects such as the United Nations and the "armament problem," the group reached some definite conclusions which it wishes to submit for your consideration:

I. We believe that greater publicity abroad about our efforts to promote peace would help the world situation. Authentic reports, published periodically, summarizing not only Government expenditures, but also the giving of the American people, through CARE, CROP, and many other agencies, could counteract our frequent reports about arms expenditures, the cost of atomic warfare, and the like.

II. We respectfully suggest that our Government increase expenditures for exchange scholarships, informative programs ("Voice of America"), and all cultural media which would promote mutual understanding among all people.

III. We suggest the need for better domestic news coverage on peace-promoting activities, such as the work done by various United Nations organizations. The television networks have a grave responsibility—and a great opportunity. Because of the greater cost of dramatic productions (as compared to factual presentations), this cost might, perhaps, be shared by the Government.

Very truly yours,

N. M. BASHARA,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1325. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 107);

S. 1436. A bill to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and to provide that the benefits of future increases in tobacco acreage allotments shall first be extended to farms on which there have been decreases in such allotments (Rept. No. 109); and

S. 1457. A bill to redetermine the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111).

By Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 1326. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 108; and

S. 1327. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 110).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment:

S. 599. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce (Rept. No. 112); and

S. 600. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter (Rept. No. 113).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

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

S. 1458. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1459. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State or Territorial operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1460. A bill for the relief of Guilermo Asla Pinuaga, Jose Espinosa Gomez, and Eusebio Asla Pinuaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1461. A bill for the relief of Chester J. Hartman; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 1462. A bill to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1463. A bill to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma; and

S. 1464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights of way and timber access roads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Audrey Jean Younkers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1466. A bill to increase the monthly rates of basic pay for certain members of the uniformed services by 25 percent; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1467. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the deferment and exemption of certain persons employed as veterinarians by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1468. A bill to provide for payment to farmers of the amount of tax paid on gasoline used by them in farming; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1469. A bill to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the west branch of Cedar Creek, northerly of a line running north seventy-eight degrees, fifty-six minutes, and one second east from a point whose coordinates in the Connecticut Geodetic System are south nine hundred thirty-seven and twenty-three one hundredths and west one thousand one hundred eight and forty one hundredths, a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1470. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 1471. A bill to provide that the Judges of the Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1472. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1473. A bill for the relief of Rok W. Shin; and

S. 1474. A bill for the relief of Valdis Mikelsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1475. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special stamp commemorative of the 125th anniversary of the establishment of savings and loan associations in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1476. A bill for the relief of Daniel Castro Quilantan and his wife, Graciela de Jesus Garza Quilantan; and

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Clorinda Perri Sturino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1478. A bill to provide for refund or credit of internal revenue taxes and customs duties paid on distilled spirits and wines lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by health authorities as a result of the hurricanes of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Marie Noelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1480. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, so as to provide for appellate review of sentences, on appeal by the defendant, in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1481. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards of training and experience for operating personnel of railroads, and for other purposes; and

S. 1482. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards of safety for railroad tracks, bridges, and related facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission on Nursing Services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

DESIGNATION OF A CERTAIN WATERWAY AT BRIDGEPORT, CONN., AS A NONNAVIGABLE STREAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare a certain portion of the west branch of Cedar Creek at Bridgeport, Conn., a nonnavigable stream. This proposed legislation is needed in connection with the construction of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway in the State of Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Hon. Newman E. Argraves, highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut, explaining the need for this proposed legislation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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. 1469) to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the west branch of Cedar Creek, northerly of a line running north seventy-eight degrees, fifty-six minutes, and one second east from a point whose coordinates in the Connecticut Geodetic System are south nine hundred thirty-seven and twenty-three one hundredths and west one thousand one hundred eight and forty-one hundredths, a nonnavigable stream, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Hartford, Conn., March 8, 1955.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: The layout of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway through Bridgeport crosses over a portion of the dredged channel and established harbor lines of the west branch of Cedar Creek. Thus, in order to cross this area, it will be necessary to have a portion of the west branch of Cedar Creek declared a nonnavigable waterway. I respectfully request, therefore, that you introduce a bill into Congress to make this change effective.

I am attaching, hereto, a bill which has been prepared by this department which should adequately cover the situation, but, of course, it is subject to your review and such changes as you may feel are necessary. This matter has been discussed with both the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the city officials of Bridgeport and there is no reason to expect that there will be any opposition to this bill.

For your information, I am attaching a print showing the area affected by this bill. The highway department will acquire the riparian rights of all owners of uplands which border the area of waterway affected.

We are hopeful that favorable action by Congress will be forthcoming at an early date as this suggested bill is noncontroversial and requires no appropriation of Federal funds. If additional information is needed or you desire a representative of the highway department to advise you or appear in behalf of this bill, please let me know.

I want to thank you very much for the prompt attention you gave to this department's recent request for the introduction of a similar bill regarding the Greenwich Harbor.

Very truly yours,
NEWMAN E. ARGRAVES,
State Highway Commissioner.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Connecticut. It is my understanding that a similar bill will be introduced in the other body by the Honorable ALBERT W. CRETELLA, Representative of Connecticut's Third District.

The introduction of this bill has been requested by the senior judge of the district of Connecticut, the Honorable J. Joseph Smith.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, a statement prepared by me on the bill, a letter addressed to me by Judge Smith explaining the need for an additional judge, the enclosures mentioned in his letter, and a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Bridgeport, Conn., Bar Association, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement and other matters mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1470) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Connecticut, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the district of Connecticut. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Connecticut, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts *Judges*
* * * * *
"Connecticut ..... 3"

The statement, letter, enclosures, and resolution, presented by Mr. BUSH, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am introducing in the Senate today a bill calling for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of an additional Federal district judge for the district of Connecticut.

The creation of an additional Federal judgeship in Connecticut is regarded as being urgently needed by the present judges. In a letter to me dated March 9, 1955, the senior judge, the Honorable J. Joseph Smith, requested consideration of the proposed legislation by the Connecticut delegation, and furnished statistics showing a very sharp increase in the business of the court in recent years, with consequent delays in the administration of justice which adversely affect the public.

Included in the tables furnished by Judge Smith are figures demonstrating that the caseload per judgeship in Connecticut is greater than in a number of districts which now have three judges.

Judge Smith informs me that the Honorable Charles E. Clark, chief judge of the second circuit court of appeals, agrees that an additional judge for Connecticut is needed at the present time.

In the past, members of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Bar Association have requested the provision of court facilities in that city for the trial of Federal court and jury cases. While believing this may prove advisable

in the future, Judge Smith does not consider the need urgent at the present time. For that reason the proposed legislation does not provide for sessions of the Federal court at Bridgeport. It would be my expectation that members of the Connecticut bar would be able to present their views on this matter when hearings on the bill are held by the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary. It is my hope that such hearings will be scheduled at an early date.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, March 9, 1955.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: I write to ask your consideration and that of your colleagues from Connecticut of provision for an additional district judge to enable this court properly to take care of the present and future volume of litigation in the district of Connecticut. Connecticut constitutes one judicial district, holding court at Hartford and New Haven under 28 United States Code 86, with two district judges under 28 United States Code 133 (act of Mar. 3, 1927, ch. 300, 44 Stat. 1348).

The volume of business in the district has, of course, greatly increased since 1927, with a very sharp increase in the last 4½ years.

In the past, we were able to handle the normal business and occasionally to help out in other districts in the second circuit and on the court of appeals, although even then there were occasional years, as during the early part of the war, when it was necessary to hold court throughout the year without recess.

Any hope Judge Anderson and I had that the increase of business would prove temporary and that two judges would be able to handle it with occasional outside help upon leveling off at about last year's level has proved illusory. The increase has now made itself plainly felt in a lengthening of time necessary to reach a case for trial, as shown by the enclosures herewith.

I have written to Judge Clark, chief judge of the circuit, and sent to him some illustrative statistics, copies of which are enclosed, together with a copy of my letter to him.

The most significant figure in the caseload statistics is that of private civil cases, for studies by the administrative office of the courts have shown that a far greater proportion of the time of the judges is required by this type of case than by any other. The caseload statistics, themselves, are of course significant only as they demonstrate the reasons for delay in disposing of litigation.

Judge Clark agrees that an additional judge is needed at this time, and will present the situation to the circuit council and the judicial conference for their recommendations.

It might prove advisable in the future to request court quarters in Fairfield County, in view of the volume of litigation now originating there. This need I do not consider urgent at present, however, since the distance to New Haven is not great and since we have available in New Haven one jury courtroom and a bankruptcy courtroom which we now use for court trials when two judges are sitting at New Haven. This bankruptcy courtroom could be converted to a small jury courtroom.

Provision of another judge is the pressing need at present. I hope that you will agree and will sponsor or support legislation to that end.

With kindest regards,

sincerely,

J. JOSEPH SMITH,
United States District Judge.

FEBRUARY 28, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. CLARK,
Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, New Haven, Conn.

DEAR JUDGE CLARK: Since talking with you last week, I have gone over our calendar situation with Gil Earl and find that it has been worsening more rapidly than I had thought. I had been a little too optimistic in the fall in thinking that a leveling off at the present volume would enable us to reach a more current status and even continue occasionally to help out elsewhere, if occasionally we received a little outside help, as in the past.

However, the sharp rise in the last 4 years continuing in the first half of this fiscal year, with resultant lengthening of time in bringing cases to trial makes it apparent that two of us can no longer handle the volume of business even with occasional outside help. The increase in population in the district, the congestion in the State courts and the steady rise in motor vehicle negligence cases all contribute to the trend.

I enclose lists of the number of criminal, civil and bankruptcy cases commenced, terminated and pending by fiscal years since 1940, including the first half of 1955.

The criminal cases have picked up a little in the recent years, following the drop after the war, but not significantly in number.

However, at present two Smith act cases are included, which may be expected to take a great deal of trial time. It is possible that on reindictment they will be consolidated, which might help so far as trial time is concerned.

The bankruptcy cases, fortunately, seldom take much court time, since petitions for review of the decisions of our two referees are comparatively rare.

From 1940 to 1951 the number of civil cases filed, while showing some upward curve, remained within our ability to handle on a practically current basis, with once in a while a chance for one of us to help out for a short time in the southern district or in Vermont. Since 1951, however, the civil load, and particularly the private civil cases which are the most time consuming have had a very considerable increase, which continues. In January and February we continued to have more filed than disposed of, so that the backlog, particularly of private civil cases, continues to increase, now totaling over 800 for all civil cases.

As shown by the table on page 1, the apparent temporary reversal of the trend in filings from 1953 to 1954 was much more than accounted for by a drop in United States plaintiff cases, private civil cases continuing the upward trend.

The time from issue to trial, which stood at the rather good level of 4.7 months in 1951, has steadily increased since and is now at an undesirably high level. The estimated present time from claim for trial list to trial, based on an analysis of 150 sample cases, is 9.5 months. Since some time elapses on the average between issue and claim for trial, it is safe to assume that the time from issue to trial is now more than 9.5 months.

I enclose also tables prepared by the clerk, showing the comparative caseload per judgeship in the district courts by circuit by fiscal year in 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, the caseload per judgeship in district courts having 2 judgeships in the same years, and the caseload per judgeship in district courts having 3 judgeships in 1954.

It will be noted that for the year 1954 on the most significant caseload figure, private civil, of the thirty-three 2-judge districts, only 3, eastern Louisiana, eastern and western Texas, have higher caseloads than Connecticut, and of the eight 3-judge districts, only 2 have higher civil and private civil caseloads per judge.

Of course, the caseloads may vary in type, so that these statistics are valuable primarily in explaining the significant one of increased delay in reaching trial and in demonstrating that the condition may be expected to worsen, rather than improve.

I believe that the caseload per judge has reached the point where three judges are permanently necessary to handle the business of the district.

This is without regard to the additional, and we hope temporary, load imposed by the pending Smith Act case and a private civil antitrust damage action against the major automobile companies.

I request, therefore, that legislation be proposed for an additional district judge for the district of Connecticut at this time.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

J. JOSEPH SMITH,
United States District Judge.

Civil cases filed by private parties, including those in which the United States is a defendant

	Fiscal year 1953	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1955 (July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954)
Fairfield	123	135	72
Hartford	154	131	89
Litchfield	2	1	1
New Haven	91	154	74
New London	8	7	5
Middlesex	4	5	1
Tolland	5	2	0
Windham	3	2	1
United States as plaintiff	232	62	54
Total	622	499	297

Time intervals from issue to trial of civil cases in which a trial was held

Fiscal year:	Median interval (months)
1951	4.7
1952	5.5
1953	6.4
1954	7.6
1955 (July 1 through Dec. 31, 1954)	8.2

Time intervals from filing to disposition of civil cases in which a trial was held

Fiscal year:	Median interval (months)
1951	8.9
1952	7.8
1953	9.6
1954	11.2
1955 (July 1 through Dec. 31, 1954)	11.7

Estimated median time interval, claims for trial list and trial 9.5 (months). Feb. 25, 1955.

Civil cases commenced and terminated during the fiscal years 1940–55 and pending cases

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1940	318	316	180
1941	293	244	229
1942	211	230	210
1943	262	235	237
1944	206	197	246
1945	324	301	269
1946	407	433	243
1947	332	270	305
1948	267	294	278
1949	337	324	291
1950	378	373	296
1951	371	312	355
1952	563	432	486
1953	622	473	635
1954	499	413	721
1955	[1] 297	[1] 228	[2] 790

[1] Commenced and terminated July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954.
[2] Pending c. o. b., December 31, 1954.

Caseload per judgeship in United States district courts (having 3 judgeships) during fiscal year 1954 (based on cases filed)

District	All civil	Private civil	Criminal
Delaware	31	17	27
Virginia, Eastern	223	131	130
Texas, Northern	436	348	164
Ohio, Southern	198	89	127
Missouri, Eastern	238	131	111
Missouri, Western	377	239	142
Oregon	173	115	54
Washington, Western	169	72	93
Connecticut [1]	250	201	96

[1] It may be noted that if the District of Connecticut is included with those districts having 3 judgeships for the sake of comparison, it would rank No. 3 as to "all civil" and "private cases" filed during the fiscal year 1954 and No. 6 as to "criminal" cases filed.

Criminal cases commenced and terminated during the fiscal years 1940–55 and pending cases

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1940	141	146	19
1941	134	131	22
1942	146	151	17
1943	276	247	46
1944	320	337	29
1945	265	252	42
1946	138	140	40
1947	120	131	29
1948	124	116	37
1949	132	142	27
1950	105	126	6
1951	127	109	24
1952	104	111	17
1953	164	152	29
1954	208	187	50
1955	[1] 71	[1] 97	[2] 24

[1] Commenced and terminated July 1, 1954. through Dec. 31, 1954.
[2] Pending c. o. b., June 11, 1954.

Bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated during the fiscal years 1940–55 and pending cases

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30th
1940	695	832	624
1941	839	601	862
1942	708	1,004	566
1943	494	775	285
1944	292	438	139
1945	162	206	95
1946	108	128	75
1947	187	143	119
1948	301	199	221
1949	438	317	342
1950	553	453	442
1951	553	599	396
1952	506	557	345
1953	542	508	379
1954	687	636	430
1955	[1] 372	[1] 318	[2] 484

[1] Commenced and terminated July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1954.
[2] Pending c. o. b., Dec. 31, 1954.

Caseload per judgeship by fiscal year in United States district courts, by circuit (based on cases filed)

Circuit	Fiscal year 1951 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1952 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1953 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1954 (229 judgeships)		
	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal
1st circuit	247	98	73	330	175	65	472	307	57	233	159	58
2d circuit	249	175	59	281	189	61	305	208	58	246	174	59
3d circuit	204	125	61	203	114	63	209	121	54	169	106	54
4th circuit	154	79	211	206	97	208	244	113	222	230	109	204
5th circuit	239	160	580	283	167	532	308	194	193	314	195	171
6th circuit	229	101	156	274	121	159	244	117	153	176	103	127
7th circuit	233	124	82	280	145	87	309	171	98	222	138	74
8th circuit	205	95	86	212	100	91	228	110	91	190	104	89
9th circuit	190	103	143	148	60	146	180	72	80	140	69	83
10th circuit	195	91	183	201	98	174	239	125	153	190	109	122

Caseload per judgeship, by fiscal years, in United States district courts having two (2) judgeships (based on cases filed)

District	Fiscal year 1951 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1952 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1953 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1954 (229 judgeships)		
	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal
Total 86 districts	204	111	180	236	126	177	261	146	114	210	127	103
2d circuit:												
Connecticut	186	96	58	282	128	47	311	175	73	250	201	96
New York:												
Northern	132	77	65	190	97	77	240	105	51	237	118	98
Western	144	87	107	219	102	130	240	109	94	230	101	89
3d circuit: Delaware	38	22	13	42	22	28	48	23	25	(1)	(1)	(1)
4th circuit:												
Maryland	221	139	133	299	150	133	462	164	120	440	163	122
South Carolina, eastern	140	78	207	218	101	212	276	170	240	294	176	190
Virginia:												
Eastern	256	135	137	326	187	171	370	212	182	(1)	(1)	(1)
Western	84	36	149	113	41	121	107	47	118	97	45	121
5th Circuit:												
Alabama, northern	161	73	186	242	117	189	282	151	168	337	167	182
Georgia:												
Northern	187	82	223	235	98	247	227	106	241	224	107	230
Middle	117	49	187	143	56	182	137	63	180	163	71	161
Louisiana:												
Eastern	306	236	163	408	288	171	477	377	197	485	405	150
Western	181	137	133	223	146	138	191	135	151	247	190	198
Texas:												
Eastern [2]										317	207	82
Western	263	147	2,417	332	193	2,553	389	229	309	366	248	249
6th circuit:												
Michigan, western [2]										112	58	42
Tennessee:												
Eastern	233	119	175	293	128	200	269	145	200	262	177	224
Middle [2]										110	43	123
7th circuit:												
Illinois:												
Eastern	141	75	95	153	82	105	191	107	87	187	117	88
Southern	114	57	43	107	55	64	115	67	46	205	56	74
Indiana:												
Northern [2]										179	86	88
Southern [2]										217	100	104
Wisconsin, eastern [2]										179	103	50
8th circuit:												
Nebraska	154	56	37	164	63	96	158	61	77	125	58	62
North Dakota [2]										98	29	47
South Dakota [2]										76	27	62

[1] Three judgeships.
[2] District having only one judgeship prior to fiscal year 1954.

Caseload per judgeship, by fiscal years, in United States district courts having two (2) judgeships (based on cases filed)—Continued

District	Fiscal year 1951 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1952 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1953 (202 judgeships)			Fiscal year 1954 (229 judgeships)		
	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal	All civil	Private civil	Criminal
9th circuit:												
Arizona	113	54	617	107	56	534	107	58	226	108	75	209
Idaho [2]										102	54	38
Montana	68	33	52	90	28	61	91	41	41	75	41	48
Nevada [2]										43	21	88
Hawaii	40	9	77	72	7	58	81	10	75	25	12	59
10th Circuit:												
Colorado [2]										183	102	217
Kansas	277	120	107	278	121	113	331	160	95	396	198	133
New Mexico [2]										115	83	109
Utah [2]										99	43	62

[2] District having only one judgeship prior to fiscal year 1954.

NOTE.—Number criminal cases indicated include immigration cases for fiscal years 1951 and 1952 and exclude same for fiscal years 1953 a nd1954.

BRIDGEPORT BAR ASSOCIATION, INC.,
November 8, 1954.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: At a recent meeting of the executive committee of the Bridgeport Bar Association the following resolution was adopted:

"The Bridgeport Bar Association requests the early establishment of courthouse facilities for the trial of Federal court and jury cases in Bridgeport."

It was voted that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Attorney General of the United States, United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, Senator BUSH, Senator PURTELL, Representative MORANO, and Representative SADLAK.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN C. THOMPSON,
Secretary.

COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 25, 1955, Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, introduced a joint resolution in the House of Representatives which would establish a Commission on Nursing Services.

Today, I introduce a similar joint resolution in the Senate and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the subject be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) for the establishment of a Commission on Nursing Services, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

We are faced today with an increasingly serious shortage of trained nurses. The problem of securing adequate care for the sick is one which should concern all of us. Some 55,000 nurses should be graduated each year to keep up with the increasing demand. Yet our nursing schools are graduating only about 30,000 a year. It is not enough that we be concerned with the problem of providing better facilities for the sick. We must also face the problem of staffing these facilities.

Although many private studies have been made in regard to overcoming the nursing shortage and improving the utilization of nurses, there remains a need for a central source of facts and expert opinion about nursing care for the entire field of health service.

This joint resolution would set up a Commission composed of 12 members—4 appointed by the President, 4 by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Half of each group would be chosen from private life and would include representatives from the nursing and medical professions.

The Commission would be authorized to make studies and recommendations and would:

Evaluate what the changing health needs of the public are;

Appraise the resources in money, manpower, and skills necessary to deal with these health needs;

Study the relationship between the economic status of nurses, the professional skills required, and the existing personnel shortage;

Analyze the various techniques and arts of nursing, including all successful new methods or devices, and indicate where they may best be applied;

Encourage additions to the body of knowledge of nursing as a discipline and thus permit more of the practice of nursing to be based on scientific principles.

I want to make it perfectly clear that the provisions of this joint resolution will in no way conflict with titles III and IV of the Health Improvement Act of 1955, but rather will complement the provisions of that act.

In this regard, I would like to call particular attention to section 1 (b) of the joint resolution, which states:

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as authorizing or intending any interference with the programs of study and improvement of patient care which are being carried forward by the professional nurses' organizations, or by public or private endeavor, but rather this joint resolution shall be construed as an effort to augment such programs through the marshaling of resources for a multidisciplinary approach to the problem.

It is my hope that this joint resolution will at the proper time receive the careful consideration of the Senate, for the shortage of trained nurses is a critical one, and specific action to meet this crisis is required.

TREATMENT OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the President of the United States in his health message to the Congress singled out for special attention and urgent action a health problem which today ranks as the most serious of all health problems confronting the Nation. I make reference to the problem of mental illness.

In evaluating the seriousness of this problem, the President was undoubtedly cognizant of the findings of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which, in 1953 and 1954, undertook to conduct an investigation of our major diseases. The scope of this investigation included, among others, cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, rheumatism, arthritis, and mental illness. These are the major diseases which take such a tremendous toll in lives, suffering, and dollars each year. In reporting its findings in March 1954, the committee stated:

There is probably no more serious problem in the health field today than that of mental illness.

According to information furnished me by the National Association for Mental Health, evidence of the toll taken by mental illness is shocking. Year after year the number of persons in mental hospitals has been steadily increasing. There are today more patients in mental hospitals than in all other hospitals combined. This is a staggering fact. Let us ponder this fact carefully and weigh its frightful import.

I am advised that today there are approximately 1,400,000 patients in all the hospitals of this country. Approximately 730,000, or more than half of the total, are patients in mental hospitals. This fact reveals that there are more hospital patients suffering from mental illness than from heart disease, cancer, tuberculosis, infantile paralysis, and all other physical diseases combined. The figure 730,000 does not include another 400,000 men, women, and children who are in need of mental hospital care, but are unable to receive it because the present facilities are inadequate; nor does the figure include the hundreds of thousands who are now under treatment in general

hospitals primarily for physical diseases and who are also suffering from some form of mental disorder.

Thus far, I have referred only to the hospitalized victims of mental illness. In addition to these, there are very reliably estimated to be more than 9 million individuals who are not hospitalized, but who are so seriously incapacitated by mental disorders as to impair greatly their ability to work, to discharge their family responsibilities, to serve as useful members of their communities, and to serve their Nation in its Armed Forces. There is literally not a single facet of personal or social life which is not touched in one way or another by mental illness.

Today, when the element of industrial productivity is so vital to the Nation's economy, and particularly to its defensive strength, we are confronted by the fact that between 20 and 25 percent of all employees in any commercial or industrial organization are suffering from some form of mental disorder. These disorders range from the so-called neuroses to outright psychosis, and result in impaired efficiency, accidents, poor morale, absenteeism, damage, destruction, and reduced production. The loss to industry as a result of mental illness is estimated conservatively to be $3 billion a year. This sum is in addition to $1 billion of tax monies expended each year to provide care and treatment for the mentally ill in hospitals, and an estimated $2 billion loss in earnings and purchasing power suffered by new patients admitted to mental hospitals each year.

I would also like to point out at this time that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in its recent report to the Congress estimated that 1 out of every 12 children born in this country today will spend some of his or her lifetime in a mental institution. In a plea for a special study of mental-health-care facilities, the report also stated that:

(a) About 250,000 new patients will be admitted to mental hospitals and institutions this year;

(b) The number of prolonged-care patients at such institutions throughout the country is increasing at the rate of 10,000 a year, despite new treatments to relieve mental ills;

(c) Survey compilations suggest that as many as 9 million persons, about 6 percent of the population, now suffer some form of mental disorder;

(d) About 10 percent of these 9 million are considered in need of hospital care;

(e) Mental patients are costing the taxpayers a billion dollars a year, exclusive of their incalculable losses in manpower and as income (tax) producers; and

(f) Most of the Nation's 650,000 prolonger-care psychiatric patients are being treated in State and Federal tax-supported mental institutions.

No other illness takes so frightful a toll as mental illness, despite the fact that for no other serious illness is the outlook for cure so hopeful. According to Dr. George S. Stevenson, medical director of the National Association for Mental Health, the outlook for mental illness is more hopeful than it is for any serious chronic disease.

The National Association for Mental Health, the organization which, together with its 400 affiliates, has been carrying on the citizens' fight against mental illness, states that mental illness can be conquered with a three-point program of research, training, and treatment.

Research has already produced very positive results in the treatment of mental illness. Serious diseases, like schizophrenia and involutional melancholia—considered almost hopeless 30 years ago—are today showing improvement and recovery in about 60 percent of the cases treated. Research holds out a very definite hope for even greater success with these and other mental diseases. But if research in this field is to make headway, it must be adequately financed, for mental illness covers more than 100 different diseases and accounts for more than 50 percent of all hospitalized casualties. Yet, I am informed, mental illness research receives less than 3 percent of the total expenditure for all medical research.

The second plank in this threefold program is training. The entire field of mental illness—clinics, private practice, hospitals, research laboratories—is plagued by a severe shortage of trained personnel, such as psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, psychologists, and nurses. Thousands of new professional people are needed to fill existing vacancies and to staff the new services as they develop and expand.

The third point in this program for the defeat of mental illness is treatment. Most mentally sick people can be helped by treatment, but very few can get it. Most towns and cities do not have even a single private psychiatrist or a psychiatric clinic where people with mental disorders can go for treatment. In places where these services exist, they are swamped by long waiting lists. If there were enough psychiatrists and clinics, we would soon see a marked decline in the ravages of this disease. In the mental hospitals, too, treatment is grossly inadequate. Most mental hospitals are overcrowded, understaffed, underequipped, and provide little more than custodial care for most of their patients. As a result, hundreds of thousands of patients hang on hopelessly as public charges for months, years, even decades. Given proper treatment, up to 70 percent of the patients entering mental hospitals could be discharged as improved or recovered within a year. Together, research, training and treatment make up a realistic program which can reverse the trend of mental illness, and can cut down its tremendous toll.

This program is now in progress, and is being carried on by the National Association for Mental Health. This association is rallying citizens in all communities throughout the country to the fight against mental illness. But this organization cannot carry on the fight alone. It is in need of the same kind of support which is given to the other national health organizations. Widespread and substantial citizens' support for the fight against mental illness is long overdue. Our Nation has rallied to conquer one scourge after another. Infantile paralysis and tuberculosis are on the way to being wiped out. Important research inroads are being made in the fight against cancer and heart disease. It is now time for the people of the Nation to throw massive support into the fight against mental illness—by far the most serious health problem of all.

In keeping with the spirit of the President's comments and to express the sense of the Congress concerning this serious problem with which the Nation is confronted, I, together with 61 colleagues, submit the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and

Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental health organizations associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and

Whereas the mental health fund is in dire need of public support in order to improve conditions in mental hospitals, provide more adequate treatment for the mentally and emotionally ill, carry on research in the field of the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and promote mental health education; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 1, 1955 and ending May 7, 1955, will be observed as National Mental Health Week; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join and cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) submitted by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG), was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SELF-DETERMINATION BY IRELAND OF ITS FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United Nations Charter, article I, paragraph 3, declares it to be the intention of member nations "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of * * * self-determination"; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter, in listing the objectives to be sought by the United States and Great Britain, declares "respect for the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" and expresses the wish "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them"; and

Whereas the unnatural division of Ireland is the result not of the express wishes of her inhabitants but of arbitrary action which has operated to forcibly deprive the people of Ireland of their inherent right of self-determination; and

Whereas use of the veto by Communist Russia to deprive Ireland of United Nations membership is the most persuasive recommendation the Republic could have for fair treatment by the free nations of the world; and

Whereas while Ireland naturally belongs in the Atlantic Pact, where its advantageous location would offer vital air and shipping bases, it is forced to abstain from membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization because part of its territory is occupied by one of the participating powers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Republic of Ireland should enjoy the same right of self-determination as to the form and extent of its government as is guaranteed to all nations under the United Nations and Atlantic Charters, and that, in the spirit of and under the authority of these charters, steps should be initiated looking toward a general plebiscite at which the people of all 32 counties of Ireland could be given opportunity, free of coercion or outside intervention, to declare for or against the union of the countries of Northern and Southern Ireland.

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the present session I, along with other Senators, submitted a resolution (S. Res. 21), dealing with the sense of the Senate as it relates to the Republic of Ireland. Since that time a number of Senators have expressed their interest in desiring to be cosponsors of the resolution. So today, I submit a second resolution on the same subject, with 17 cosponsors, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be kept open for the remainder of the day, in order to give any Senator, who may desire to do so, an opportunity to become a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held open for additional cosponsors, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. IVES, and Mr. MAGNUSON) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives, 65th Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

REPORTS ON IMPROVEMENT AND EXPANSION OF HORTICULTURAL AND AGRICULTURAL WEATHER FORECASTING SERVICES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution which requests the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the steps taken to improve and expand horticultural and agricultural weather forecasting services.

In 1940, the Weather Bureau was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Commerce, only after assurance was given that the service to farmers would not be decreased. The war naturally led to major emphasis on military and civil aviation programs. This, I fear, coupled with a reduction in governmental expenditures for the Weather Bureau, has prevented the Agricultural Forecasting Service from developing as was expected.

Modern surveys show that for the Weather Bureau to do a fully adequate job of serving the American farmer, it must provide at least the following:

First. All the latest available forecasts by radio or television, prior to the beginning of farm operations which take several days to complete.

Second. A forecast for the farmer's specific locality.

Third. More frequent, longer-period forecasts from 3 to 6 days in advance.

Fourth. Seasonal forecasts for the farmer.

Fifth. Forecasts with more meteorological details.

Sixth. Cooperation with the land-grant agricultural colleges, to find out more basic information as to the interaction of weather and farm production.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it is time to ascertain how much progress has been made by the Department of Commerce in the field of agricultural weather forecasting. I am submitting this resolution, which will require the Secretary of Commerce to report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, not later than May 1, 1955, as to what steps have been taken to improve and expand the horticultural and agricultural forecasting services along the line of the six points mentioned above. I am also including in the resolution, a request that the Secretary of Agriculture report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry his recommendations for adequate forecasting service for the Nation's farmers.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 82) submitted by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, (1) That the Secretary of Commerce is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture at the earliest practicable date and not later than May 1, 1955, as to what steps have been taken since the transfer in 1940 of the United States Weather Bureau from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Commerce, to expand and improve horticultural and agricultural forecasting services to the extent necessary to provide farmers with (a) adequate forecasts for their specific localities, (b) more frequent forecasts covering periods of 3 to 6 days, (c) seasonal forecasts, (d) forecasts containing more meteorological details, and (e) such other weather-forecasting services as may be necessary to assist farmers in planning their operations, and (2) what plans have been made by the Secretary of Commerce to meet any deficiencies that may have been observed, and (3) that the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to report to the Senate Agriculture Committee his recommendations for an adequate forecasting service for the Nation's farmers.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as an additional cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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. IVES:

Address delivered by Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before Navy League at Detroit, Mich., on December 3, 1954.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

Newspaper comment on reclamation projects.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Chair desires to say that the Senate today received the following nominations: Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service

officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Korea, to be Ambassador of the United States to Peru; and William S. B. Lacy, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Korea.

Notice is hereby given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

WISCONSIN AND THE NATION SUPPORT DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, since introducing my bill, S. 788, to establish a dairy research center at Madison, Wis., I have received a great number of messages endorsing the project.

I send to the desk now a series of excerpts from some of these communications, and ask unanimous consent that the material be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR WILEY ON DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER

The reason the idea of a Dairy Research Center has caught on so tremendously is that ours is basically a Research Age, an Age of Science, an Age of Exploration. And Americans, best of all, know what research, what science, what exploration can perform.

The dairy industry of our Nation recognizes the need for a new type of approach to meet the dairy problem. That is the word which comes to me particularly from Madison where some of the first dairy research in the Nation is already being performed, albeit with limited funds.

All over America, whole industries are being revolutionized by new processes. The food industry in particular has felt the impact of new methods of production, packaging, and distribution. Frozen orange juice, frozen soup, frozen fishsticks are but a few of the new type items which have poured on to the American market, winning millions upon millions of new customers. The American housewife has new needs, new patterns of feeding her family. The food industry must adjust to those patterns.

And milk, nature's first product, nature's most important product, nature's healthiest product—offers by far the greatest potentialities of all—for new methods, new products and by-products, new types of processing, merchandising, and distribution.

HALF WAY OR WHOLE WAY

In this effort, we need to tap the finest research minds in America just as we are putting our best brains to work on unlocking the secrets of the atom.

Rut-bound people may say, "Let dairy research—which everyone agrees is very good indeed—be continued on its present scattered, decentralized basis."

But I say that halfway measures will produce only halfway results. I say that a few million dollars spent for a Dairy Research Center now will repay itself ultimately in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars of new wealth for America and in terms of improved health for our citizens.

The status quo mind implies, "Let's bumble along on our present limited research basis. Let's do a little research here and a little research there."

But the mind with vision will want us to push full speed ahead in a coordinated attack on the Nation's dairy problems.

Remember, now, I am not speaking merely for the dairy industry. I am speaking for the health of America. I am not speaking for creating a handsome new building as such; I am speaking and writing for getting a job done—through people—the best people we can mobilize—in new buildings or old, with whatever facilities are needed to do the job.

Why cannot we send word to the world that in addition to the work of our scientists in testing A-bombs at Yucca Flats, Nev., other United States scientists have just been given the green light for a "Manhattan district-like" project for milk? This will be a project to build—not to destroy—life. What better-type-message can we send to mankind?

And so, I hope that the Senate Agriculture Committee will take action on S. 788.

There follow now excerpts from a handful out of the great many spontaneous communications which I have received in praise of S. 788.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS

Where the message has come officially from an organization, I have included the full name and address, but where it is from an individual I have referred only to his location, since the individual obviously wrote to me in a private and personal capacity.

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
Fond Du Lac, Wis., February 18, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The State board of Pure Milk Products Cooperative at its meeting today, unanimously endorsed your bill S. 788.

The board has requested me to write you a letter of appreciation. The members are deeply grateful for all the past services which you have rendered the dairy industry. You have never failed us in our time of need. You are always in the forefront when the battle for justice for the dairy farmer takes place.

* * * * *

In respect to bill S. 788, in introducing this bill, once again you have shown statesmanlike foresight. We believe that a laboratory devoted exclusively to dairy experimentation has long been needed. The board has high hopes of what it may accomplish. Assuredly such a laboratory should be located in Wisconsin, the heart of dairyland.

We sincerely congratulate you for introducing bill S. 788. The membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative will work earnestly for this bill's adoption by the Congress.

WILLIAM F. GROVES,
President.

WISCONSIN SWISS & LIMBURGER CHEESE PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION, MONROE, WIS.

I want you to know that we appreciate your efforts and work you do in behalf of the dairy industry of Wisconsin and the Nation as a whole.

The passing of the bill No. S. 788 to establish a dairy research center laboratory in Madison would be a great benefit to all dairying. The country needs more Senators, like you, who are concerned with our agricultural problems.

FRED GALLI, *Manager.*

LETTER FROM JOHNSTOWN, PA.

I thoroughly agree with what you said in the article that was published in the February issue of Better Farming magazine on the need for a dairy research center. Included in your aims for this project was research to combat animal disease and research into human nutritional needs.

I visited the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., several years ago and have since wondered why this centralized thinking and research could not be applied to many of our problems particularly two which come to mind; your proposed project for dairying and medical research—primarily cancer.

Possibly every State in the Union have many scientists at work in many centers of learning on problems that relate to dairying. There does not seem to be any correlation of purpose or results which makes for many divergent theories and little practical attainment.

LETTER FROM LONDON, OHIO

Read your article in Better Farming. I am all for it. Get your ball rolling; get dairy and farming back of it.

Wisconsin (near Madison) is where this should be.

Ohio will be for it to a Congressman.

LETTER FROM MUKWONAGO, WIS.

We appreciate your taking the dairy farmer's problems seriously and read with great interest and hope your Better Farming article.

LETTER FROM MADISON, WIS.

Have just received my copy of Better Farming." Have read and reread and studied some more your very interesting article on (We Need a Dairy Research Center).

As you well know, we have here at Madison, our new Babcock Hall, with its dairy rooms and equipment, its numerous laboratories, salesroom, and its classrooms. All this governed and supervised by the Wisconsin Dairy Research Foundation.

Also the larger, new, dairy barn with its laboratories; has just recently been dedicated and turned into use, and an immense amount of good should be the result of its use.

Now if you as our senior Senator from Wisconsin can bring about a project such as you describe and be instrumental in bringing Federal aid into Wisconsin to help carry on dairy research work in our laboratories here or with more added, if and when needed, this would be fine, and no doubt a great deal of good will result.

In the September 29 issue of Capital Times of Madison appeared this item by Jack K. Kyle, Madison, executive secretary of Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives. While in Norway he discovered that the farmer received 75 cents out of the consumers' dollar, this compared to 42 cents received by the American farmer. In view of this fact, would it not be wise to find ways of closing this wide gap between producer and consumer?

LETTER FROM MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Just read S. 788 in RECORD. It is a fine bill.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Just read We Need Dairy Research Center, page 29 of Better Farming, February issue. My congratulations to you for laying the first cornerstone on this project.

POSTAL SUBSIDIES AND FARMERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief letter I have received from Mrs. Charles W. Cotton, of Glasgow, Mont.

In this letter Mrs. Cotton protests $8 million of postal subsidies to Life magazine, which has repeatedly attacked the farmers, and which she quotes as saying in a recent issue: "Whatever else you may think of Benson, you can still tell the keeper from the monkeys."

I should like to direct the attention of the Committee on Post Office and Civil

Service and of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the contents of this letter.

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

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 21, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have written to Life magazine protesting its attitude toward farmers but can't seem to get past the 13th secretary, so to speak.

In a recent Life article, it said: "Whatever else you may think of Benson (Ezra Taft), you can still tell the keeper from the monkeys."

The Government pays Life magazine $8 million a year subsidies to educate the American people into believing that farmers are monkeys.

I say any farmer who buys Life is one—but even more—isn't there some way Congress can protect us farmers from this type of education? They are safe from being sued for libel but do we have to continue their subsidy?

Sincerely,

Mrs. CHARLES W. COTTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

INCREASE OF BASIC PAY RATES FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES — BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to increase by 25 percent the basic rates of pay for certain members of the Armed Forces. I send the bill to the desk, request its appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1466) to increase the monthly rates of basic pay for certain members of the uniformed services by 25 percent, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the monthly rates of basic pay provided by section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for all members of the uniformed services having more than 2 cumulative years of service, are hereby increased by 25 percent.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month which begins after the date of its enactment.

MILITARY MANPOWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before anyone questions the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the proposed 25-percent increase in pay for all members of the military service with 2 years of service behind them, I would suggest that he look at the facts and study them quite carefully.

The Armed Forces of the United States are faced with an extremely grave problem—manpower—trained and skilled men who are willing to make one of the branches of the military service their career. The morale of the serviceman is low, reenlistment rates are near rock bottom, and they are receiving fewer fringe benefits than before.

Young men, today, seem to enter the service because they have to; when their tour of duty is up, they are not reenlisting. This trend has proven very costly to the taxpayers, and the Armed Forces do not have an adequate number of highly trained and skilled men to operate the expensive modern technical equipment and processes now used in the armed services. This condition will not improve until some new changes are put into force.

The Nation is in need of a defense force of approximately 3 million professional fighting men, according to administration estimates. Actually, according to administration estimates, the figure is 2,850,000 men. But it is impossible under existing conditions to meet this goal. The composite rate of reenlistments in the services for 1954 is only 20 percent, thus it is expected that it will be necessary to replace approximately 800,000 men during the coming year. During an appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson indicated that he feared that most of the 1 million eligible to leave the service this year would do so. This extremely large turnover is a great financial burden, and promotes inefficiency.

The reenlistment rate figures from the Army, Navy and Air Force alone give sufficient reason to be concerned about our armed-service-personnel program. It was not an understatement on the part of Secretary of Defense Wilson when he said before the House Armed Services Committee that this situation "invites and encourages mediocrity," which we cannot tolerate if we wish to maintain a strong and effective defense force.

In the Army renlistments dropped to an overall percentage of 10.1 percent in 1953 and in 1954 the figure for the first 11 months was 10.8 percent. In the Air Force the reenlistment rate in the 1953 fiscal year was 67 percent, and it dropped to 24 percent in fiscal year 1955, July to November 1954. In the Navy the overall reenlistment rate prior to World War II was as high as 80 percent. In July to September of 1954 the figure dropped to 8.8 percent. It is interesting to note that where figures are given for both those of career and noncareer status, the career reenlistment rate is much higher, although there has been a decline in this group too. Unfortunately, the career classification is very limited in all branches of the service. In July to September of 1954 the career reenlistment rate in the Navy was 58.8 percent and noncareer was 5.5 percent. In July to December of 1953 the reenlistment rate of career Navy men was 86.4 percent and noncareer reenlistments were only 11.5 percent. The Department of the Army figures for calendar year 1954 show a 24.5 percent reenlistment rate for Regular Army personnel and 3.6 percent for those who were induced under selective service.

The effects of the startling figures shown above are far reaching indeed. In recent years, a study by the Navy Department of the need for experienced personnel required to operate and maintain the complex equipment of our modern Navy established 75 percent as the "career" rate and 25 percent as the "noncareer" rate of reenlistments essential to a sound personnel structure capable of properly manning the fleets. I would assume that something comparable would apply to the other branches of the service. Under this standard, the present reenlistment figures are far below the figures established as sound.

In the Air Force it costs the taxpayers $14,755 to take an enlisted man through the first routine 4-year enlistment. If he is to become an electronic expert, the cost may be as high as $75,000. The Air Force officers cost even more. For a triple-rated pilot of an atom bomber, the cost jumps to more than $600,000 for 1 man. The yearly average cost of training a man in the Navy is about $3,200. In the Army, training and maintenance costs for a 3-year tour of service is $16,200. When the reenlistment rate is so low that we must be continually training new men, this one item meant a dead loss to the Army alone of $819,200,000 for 1954. The Air Force loses at least $4 billion for each enlistment period. The high rate of turnover in the Navy costs nearly $100 million per year. And the money is not all.

In addition to this dollar cost, according to information received from the services, the importance of reenlistment is reflected in terms of a more effective defense capability. For example, this means:

Increased effectiveness: The career servicemen performs more efficiently, provides better quality work and returns more defense per defense dollar spent.

Decreased training costs: The retention of servicemen reduces expenditures for procurement, formal training, on-the-job training, transportation, travel time, incidentals, and loss of manpower efficiency during the break-in period.

Production and continuity of personnel: Increased production is a result of decreased turnover in personnel. A higher level of experience represented by reenlistees would require less personnel to accomplish the necessary tasks, and manpower requirements could be revised downward, without affecting the military preparedness.

Investment in supplies and equipment: Complex and expensive equipment demands the highest skill and training possible to avoid temporary breakdowns, complete loss of equipment, loss of man-hours, and possible loss of life. Modern fighting equipment and

weapons systems, costing many thousands of dollars, demand the services of highly trained and experienced airmen. I think that it can be agreed, that the cost of improper maintenance and handling of this complex equipment in terms of combat readiness and potential, not to mention the safety of the individual life, defies measurement in terms of dollars.

This problem is something which every American has to understand—Secretary of the Air Force Talbott stated in an address given in November of last year. He continued:

> If our people want to survive, it is up to them to make life more attractive to the men who are trying to protect them. We accomplish nothing by spending billions for equipment and only nickels for professional skill.

During recent years servicemen have received more inducements to get out of the service than to reenlist. So long as that situation exists it will be difficult to maintain a professional force. Men in the service look forward to the benefits of a discharge, college education, on-job training, mustering-out pay, unemployment pay, disability pensions, home and farm loans, hospital care, and other benefits which out-weigh the current benefits of reenlistment. It must be realized that a big factor in maintaining an all-volunteer force of capable men in the services is to increase the gains for those staying in the service.

A choice must be made as to whether young men should be enticed into enlisting in the Armed Forces because of the benefits they will receive when they get out, or whether to encourage them to reenlist because of the opportunities and benefits available to them while in the service.

The first step toward building this volunteer force would be an across-the-board 25 percent military pay increase. My proposal would apply to all enlisted men and officers who have more than 2 years of active service. President Eisenhower recommended a military pay raise to Congress in his message of January 13, 1955. In my opinion, it does not go far enough. The administration plan would provide only an approximate increase of 6.7 percent on a selective basis for those with 2 and 3 years active duty. Instead of an across-the-board raise, the administration measure lists selective increases which range as high as 25 percent of base pay for second lieutenants with 3 years service and 17 percent for corporals up for reenlistment. Some increases are as low as 2 percent. As a matter of fact, I think a buck private's pay would be increased to the extent of $7.80 a month. The President's incentive pay raise is a move in the right direction, but the increase should be nondiscriminatory. If one serviceman, who plans a career in a branch of the service, receives a 25 percent pay raise, they all should.

Military pay increases have not kept up with those in private industry and the increasing cost of living index. Since 1939, the cost of living has increased 200 percent, and in that period the wages of organized labor show an increase of 315 percent. In contrast the enlisted man in the Air Force has had an increase of only 110 percent, and the officers an increase of 59 percent. In the Army some grades have increased as little as 18.3 percent since 1939. The pay of naval officers of all ranks has increased 43 percent since 1942. Since 1941 enlistee pay raises have amounted to an average of 191 percent. A 25 percent pay increase for all career servicemen would seem to be more of a step in the right direction.

Traditionally one of the advantages of a career in the Armed Forces had over private industry was that the services offered a large number of nonpay benefits or fringe benefits not found in industry, thus compensating for the difference in salaries. Today the situation is changed, industry is moving more and more into the field of nonpay benefits for their employees. In reverse the members of the armed services have lost a number of these benefits. These fringe benefits should be reinstated for men in the service. These are the true incentives to a military career—post exchange and commissary facilities, family housing, disability retirement benefits, medical care for military personnel and families, education facilities and relocation allowances for moving and reassignment. The administration plan would reinstate many of these benefits. Once reinstated, they should be properly carried out.

In addition to the fringe benefits themselves, there are a number of complaints about conditions in the services which can be corrected only at the administrative level. There is some criticism about the operation of the selective-service program, particularly in regard to discriminatory selection of draftees and granting of deferments. Many feel that there is a great deal of insecurity under this system. Young men receive no indication when they may be called. If they are classified 4-F, they are subject to recall at any time because of revised medical standards or merely because a new draft board takes over. Mal-assignment is a frequent complaint; little choice is given in many branches of the service. A fairer promotion system would give morale a big boost. Too often, enlistees are put in a field in which they lack interest and qualifications. There should be an improved placement program. Another important factor would be an equality of facilities at all training centers, camps, and bases. Some are noted for their complete facilities—laundry, dry cleaning establishments, hobby centers, entertainment facilities, good food preparation and mess halls, and adequate living quarters. Others are likewise noted for the lack of such things.

An armed service of professionals cannot be built by conscription. As in any profession there must be a certain amount of incentive. The current situation in the branches of the service gives very little incentive to a young man to make a career out of the Army, Navy, Marines, or Air Force. If the rate of reenlistment can be greatly accelerated, training costs will be reduced, the turnover will be reduced, and the cost to the taxpayer will, as a result, be less.

Trained and experienced personnel are essential in today's Armed Forces. Pilots, navigators, mechanics, artillery experts, radar operators, and industrial workers require years of training to reach maximum efficiency. They must be held together as teams, for while continuity is important at policy forming levels, it is also very necessary down through the lower echelons. These men must be retained by the Armed Forces as significant contributors to our overall security. The only way is through a professional armed service.

At this time I do not have an estimate of the cost involved in my pay-raise proposal. The initial cost would undoubtedly be great, but when a volunteer professional Armed Force is established, the original cost will be more than offset. Fewer dollars will be needed for training of new recruits and specialized training funds will decrease because of a decreased turnover of men. Stability among our Armed Forces would prove to be less expensive. We do not have such stability today.

RESERVE PROGRAM

In addition to the current problem of building a strong voluntary armed force, there must be some form of a reserve to fall back on in time of general mobilization.

The present Reserve system requires that all veterans belong to a reserve, but they have a choice as to active or inactive reserves for a fixed number of years. Officers are to remain for an indefinite numbers of years. In addition, there is the National Guard, a reserve open to men before they enter the Armed Forces.

The present Reserve system has been subject to a great deal of criticism. One of the major complaints about the Reserve system is that it is not unified and lacks organization. The Reserves lack adequate facilities, training programs, uniform allowances; and in some cases the reservists receive no pay. It is suggested that a unified Reserve, all branches under one administrative head, would eliminate waste. Armories should be available for all branches of the Reserve. At the present time, Army, Navy, and Air Force reserve groups must maintain their own armories other than those operated by the National Guard. A unified Reserve would make all policies for each of the branches of the service. This would eliminate different promotion practices, terms of service and equipment; and supply facilities would be equalized.

The new administration proposal would extend the draft until July 1, 1959, and at the same time, set up a new form of UMT. The draft term would be kept at 24 months and the minimum draft age would remain at 18½. The newest plan would apply to youths under 19. One hundred thousand men of this age bracket each year would receive 6 months' basic training and then 9½ years in the active Reserves. The program would start with volunteers, but it could shift to the draft basis if necessary, with local boards selecting trainees.

This program would allow most veterans of 24 months' active duty to pass into the nonorganized Reserve, subject to call only in general mobilization.

This new plan would empower the National Guard to draft men who have completed 6 months' training, or a period of active duty in the Armed Forces, when essential to maintaining a Guard unit. The method of selecting such men was not explained when the plan was submitted.

In addition, National Guard enlistees with no prior service would be required to take 6 months' basic training in the Armed Forces. States would be allowed to set up new militia units that would replace the National Guard units called to active duty in an emergency.

There are many objections to this new administration manpower proposal. Any draft plan and more particularly the 6-month plan connected with a long reserve commitment bring a great deal of instability into a young man's life, unless he intends to make a branch of the Armed Forces his career. The future of these men is always overshadowed with the possibility of recall on short notice.

How much actual value is there in only 6 months training followed by part-time drill? In addition, there is discrimination in this plan because the first 100,000 will be the only ones who will get into the 6-month plan each year. How much training is done in these weekly meetings of the Reserves? Youths who are over 19 would be excluded from the new plan and would have to enlist or wait for the draft. Moreover, many men who are subject to Reserve training may live in places which are of considerable distance from the nearest Reserve unit.

Under some circumstances a young man might be able to wait out the draft until he was 26, and thus escape the draft because voluntary enlistments exceeded expectations. Another criticism of this Reserve plan is that veterans will be subject to involuntary assignment to active Reserve units. Veterans released since 1951 would be technically open to such a draft under the plan as written.

The main characteristics of this plan seem to be more insecurity, instability, and uncertainty for draft-age youths and their families.

Instead of relying on men who have already served, the Government might strengthen military training programs in high schools and colleges as a source of a large Reserve. At present, military training programs in our schools are generally limited to land-grant colleges and private schools. This military-training program could be extended to public and private high schools and institutions of higher learning which do not have military training programs at this time. The programs such as ROTC are integrated into the school curriculum and do not cause the interruption that other Reserve programs do in a civilian's business routine, and accomplish essentially the same thing. This program should be carried on within properly accredited State and private institutions. The instruction should be supervised by the school faculty and detached military personnel.

SHORTAGE OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

In addition to a revitalization of our military manpower program, the United States is faced with a critical shortage of engineers and scientists. This shortage is potentially a greater threat to our national security than are any weapons known to be in the arsenals of aggressor nations. As a start in overcoming this deficiency, the Government might sponsor an extensive series of aptitude tests throughout the Nation's schools, discovering the students with the proper scientific potential.

Writing in Planes, official publication of the Aircraft Industries Association of America, Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles says:

> Since 1950 there has been a steady decrease in the number of technical graduates from United States schools, which has now leveled off at less than half the 1950 figures. This alarming decline has occurred at a time when advances ni technology have imposed mounting requirements for technical personnel in industry and national defense.

Americans have been too complacent regarding our capabilities as compared with those of our enemies, particularly the Soviet Union. We must face the fact that we no longer have the technological advantages we enjoyed in past years. We must face up to the fact that the cold war of today is a technological race with the Communist world.

Weapon technology is a very important factor in our cold-war position. One airplane in one trip can deliver at great distances a bomb load to knock out one large city. This means that research and development efforts to increase the effectiveness of the payload, to improve the means and reliability of delivering it, and, conversely, efforts to defend against it, tend to dominate our national security program. And to do this we must have a continual supply of technicians and scientists. At the end of World War II it seemed evident that we had a fairly comfortable technological margin over the Communist world, and, in fact, it is probably not an exaggeration to say that our air-atomic advantage was a principal factor in maintaining a balance of power, and, consequently, peace. In the decade that has followed, however, the Soviets have made very great strides in improving their technical position not only in the atomic field, as evidenced by their atomic test in 1949 and their thermonuclear test in 1953, but also in the fields of aeronautics and electronics, both of which are essential to the effective exploitation of their atomic developments.

According to the Quarles article, reports on the Soviet Union indicate that the Soviets are exerting intensive efforts to channel the interests of Communist youth toward science and engineering. Elementary and secondary schools stress science and mathematics. Incentives are provided for advanced students in engineering and science; and liberal rewards are given to their working scientists and engineers.

It has been estimated that this year the Russians will graduate approximately 50,000 engineers—more than double the number who will receive degrees from United States colleges and universities. An estimated additional 50,000 Russians will be graduated as subprofessional engineers and trained and highly qualified technicians.

The arguments presented by Mr. Quarles are very enlightening and very persuasive. He says:

> Only by matching them in ideas and skills can we expect to achieve a reasonable degree of national security in the future.

I thoroughly agree, and something must be done now to rectify this situation. It is my understanding that the administration has made no recommendations for Federal aid to colleges for technical training which might be of value in wartime, or for direct assistance to individual students.

As a strong military manpower program needs incentives, so does the program of training scientists and highly specialized technicians.

To illustrate the seriousness of this situation, recent figures indicate that the United States has an accumulated shortage of 40,000 engineers and 10,000 scientists, and the total shortage is increasing at the rate of 10,000 a year. These figures were presented by Dr. Allen Abrams, chairman of the committee on research of the National Association of Manufacturers, at a forum meeting of the committee on February 25 in New York City.

Dr. Abrams attributes the situation to many factors. He believes that the military is drafting many men needed for national defense and scientific programs. The number of students in science and mathematics has been decreasing steadily, he said, as well as has the number of science teachers in the high schools.

In order to insure an adequate number of personnel for industry and the military trained in highly technical and skilled fields, I suggest that the Government select each year a certain number of high school students who have shown special scientific interests and capabilities and underwrite their education. In return these students could be required to put in a period of service after graduation which would be in some way beneficial to our national security, in the military or industry.

Under such a plan we could be guaranteed a period of service during which these young men and women would be of great service. Today young aspiring scientists are faced with many obstacles, such as insufficient finances. If a young man is trained while in a branch of the services, he oftentimes does not complete the specialized training until his tour of duty is nearly up and then does he not reenlist.

Less than half of our high school graduates, deemed fully qualified for college work, fail to go on to college because of economic problems and lack of motivation. One step toward stimulating greater interest in science and mathematics would be improved teaching in the sciences at the high school level. Overpopulated schools and lack of proper facilities are two of the serious problems in this case.

It has been suggested by Alan T. Waterman, Director, National Science Foundation, that it might be desirable to explore the possibilities of a Federal grant-in-aid program to the States for science and mathematics teachers in the high school somewhat similar to existing

Federal aid for certain agricultural and vocational training in the secondary schools.

It is my understanding that the Federal Government's present role in promoting the education of potential scientists and engineers is generally limited to the National Science Foundation. The Foundation was created by Congress, as an agency of the executive branch, to fill the recognized need for a focal point within Government for the development of national science policy and the support and encouragement of basic research in science.

The Foundation's fellowship system is the most direct measure by which it augments the Nation's scientific manpower resources. By the award of fellowships for predoctoral study also, the Foundation offers to an average of 600 selected students a year the opportunity to undertake at institutions of their choosing, the advanced training necessary for a career in research.

Another important program of the Foundation is one that provides grants-in-aid to universities and other research institutions for the support of basic scientific research. The Foundation also is the center and distributing point of a great deal of scientific information.

The Foundation's program is a proven success but the program should be greatly expanded and include direct assistance to students studying in the sciences and mathematics below the graduate level.

Nuclear weapons, intercontinental guided missiles, supersonic jet planes, radar warning nets, these are the sort of complex instruments on which depends our ability to preserve peace and to resist aggression if it comes. To develop them and to improve them we need men and women of the highest caliber in applied mathematics, physics, chemistry, and related fields. Yet today we are faced with a shortage of these essential personnel. The correction of this situation should receive top priority.

The Armed Forces that we have today are those that we bought 3 and 4 years ago. The armed force that we need today is the one we failed to buy at that time.

In recent wars the United States has had months to prepare her fighting forces and muster her industrial strength. This is no longer true. Today we can suffer a devastating aerial attack in a matter of hours. Time is of utmost value.

Seven to ten years are required to create a modern bomber from design to combat readiness. No aircraft flew during World War II that was not designed prior to 1942, and nothing can alter the fact that it takes years to develop a single weapon.

An ever-increasing number of scientists and engineers in research and development is the key to qualitative superiority. A quotation from President Truman's Air Policy Commission at this point is in order:

> The next war, should there be one, may well be lost in the laboratories years before the storm clouds show on the horizon.

In conclusion, Mr. President, if it is necessary to continue to draft young men under existing conditions it should also be necessary to impose an excess profits tax on industries profiting from defense contracts. If we can draft men, I believe we can draft dollars on the same basis.

Universal military training is contrary to our traditions. Conscription in the services and the reserves is not the answer to a large, effective armed force, when it is possible to build a large voluntary force of professional soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen with a little effort and determination. This should be done in the American fashion, not by compulsion and regimentation, but by providing individuals concerned with proper inducements to bring them into the fields of the military, science and engineering.

Mr. President, I recommend the following program:

First. A military pay raise—25 percent across-the-board to all servicemen with 2 years or more of active duty.

Second. Restored and increased fringe benefits for servicemen and their families.

Third. A voluntary Reserve.

Fourth. Expanded ROTC program in colleges and high schools, public and private.

Fifth. Government financed program of training scientists and engineers at college and graduate level. Federal aid to improve science programs in high schools.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 252, Calendar No. 106, providing for additional appropriations for the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making additional appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making additional appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader, and he is agreeable to having the joint resolution considered at this time. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], is ready to discuss the joint resolution now.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the appropriation of $710,000 provided by the joint resolution merely covers deficiency funds for the Department of Justice, to enable the Department to pay the fees and expenses of witnesses.

The joint resolution was passed unanimously by the House, and was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I urge the immediate passage of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER 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.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar is in order.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOMINATION OF JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Green
Allott	Clements	Hayden
Anderson	Cotton	Hennings
Barkley	Curtis	Hickenlooper
Barrett	Daniel	Hill
Beall	Dirksen	Holland
Bender	Douglas	Hruska
Bennett	Duff	Humphrey
Bible	Dworshak	Ives
Bricker	Eastland	Jackson
Bridges	Ellender	Jenner
Bush	Ervin	Johnson, Tex.
Butler	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Frear	Kefauver
Capehart	Fulbright	Kerr
Carlson	George	Kilgore
Case, N. J.	Goldwater	Knowland
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Kuchel

Langer	Murray	Smathers
Lehman	Neely	Smith, Maine
Long	Neuberger	Smith, N. J.
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Sparkman
Malone	Pastore	Stennis
Mansfield	Payne	Symington
Martin, Iowa	Potter	Thurmond
Martin, Pa.	Purtell	Thye
McCarthy	Robertson	Watkins
McClellan	Russell	Welker
Millikin	Saltonstall	Wiley
Monroney	Schoeppel	Williams
Mundt	Scott	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Murray in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there is before the Senate the nomination of John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The nomination was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1955, and hearings were conducted by the full Committee on the Judiciary on February 24 and 25, 1955; thereafter the committee considered the nomination on March 3; and later, on March 9, the committee approved the nomination and ordered it reported favorably to the Senate by a majority vote.

The nominee was born May 20, 1899, in Chicago, Ill.; graduated from Princeton University with an A. B. degree in 1920; attended Oxford University 1921–23, receiving a B. A. degree in jurisprudence; and thereafter attended New York Law School, receiving an LL. B. degree in 1924. The nominee was admitted to the New York bar in 1925 and joined the law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner & Howland—subsequently Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer—of New York City. The nominee was a member of that firm from January 1931 to February 28, 1954.

On February 10, 1954, the nominee was appointed by the President to the United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. He took the oath of office on March 4, 1954, and presently is serving in that position. While serving on the court of appeals, the nominee has participated in the decisions on approximately 100 appeals, and has written the opinions of the court in 23 of those cases.

During World War II, the nominee served in the Armed Forces as a colonel, United States Army Air Force. He was stationed in England from 1942 to 1944 as Chief of Operations, analysis section, 8th Air Force; and subsequently he was a member of the planning section for the occupation of Germany, United States Strategic Air Forces in Europe. For his service, the nominee received the United States Legion of Merit.

Representatives of the American Bar Association's committee on the Federal judiciary, the New York County Lawyers' Association, and the Bar Association of the City of New York appeared in behalf of confirmation of the nomination. Other members of the bar personally acquainted with the qualifications of the nominee also testified in his behalf, and on February 25, 1955, the nominee himself testified before the full committee.

Under the Constitution, it is incumbent upon the Members of the Senate to give their advice and consent on nominations made by the President to the Supreme Court. It is not only a constitutional duty, but is a solemn responsibility imposed upon Members of this body. Likewise, it is the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary to examine nominees to judicial positions, to determine whether the nominees possess the legal competence and judicial temperament required of appointees to such high offices.

The Committee on the Judiciary, in reporting this nomination favorably, has determined that the nominee has the proper training, legal experience, and judicial temperament necessary for appointment as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; and, accordingly, the committee has recommended that this nomination be confirmed.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read into the Record a letter addressed to me:

New York, N. Y., *February 4, 1955.*

Hon. Harley M. Kilgore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I see that your committee has set the 23d of February to consider the nomination of John M. Harlan to the Supreme Court. Unfortunately at the moment my health does not permit me to ask for a personal appearance. I therefore take the liberty of writing a letter to you on the subject, to which, of course, your committee will give such weight or lack of weight as it sees fit.

I have known Judge Harlan personally and professionally, I think, ever since he came to the bar of New York. I am able, therefore, to testify of my own knowledge that he is a man of the highest character, an accomplished lawyer and, in my opinion, he would fill with distinction a place on the Supreme Court if and when his nomination is approved.

The great reputations on that Court have been made by men who reached the bench at an age that made possible long service and of course it is difficult, in filling a vacancy, to avoid contrasting the newcomer with the veteran who has gone; but he has youth, vigor, and industry, as well as a high order of intellect. I am sure I reflect the opinion of the entire bar of New York in saying that we were gratified by his selection and that we know of nothing whatever which would militate against his confirmation.

Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

John W. Davis.

Mr. President, I have read the letter because Mr. Davis originally came from my State, and I thought his letter should be placed in the Record, inasmuch as Mr. Davis is eminent in his profession.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bible in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the gratifications in having a vote in the United States Senate arises when opportunity is presented to vote for confirmation of a Presidential nominee who not only is outstandingly qualified for the office to which nominated, but is also a warm personal friend. Such an opportunity is presented to me in the case of President Eisenhower's nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judge Harlan's biographical background is fully covered in the record of the Judiciary Committee, so I shall emphasize only the fact that he took his bachelor of arts degree from Princeton University in 1920, and then went as a Rhodes scholar to Oxford University, and attended Balliol College from 1921 to 1923, receiving a bachelor of arts in jurisprudence, and subsequently a master of arts degree. Upon returning from Oxford, he attended New York Law School, and received a bachelor of laws degree in 1924.

He was admitted to the New York bar in 1925, and since that time has had a brilliant law career. About a year ago he was appointed by the President to the United States court of appeals in the second circuit, and took the oath of office on March 4, 1954. While his term on the circuit court has been brief, his record was a brilliant one; and he has participated in the decision of many critically important cases.

Mr. President, I have known John Harlan personally since before his graduation from Princeton, 35 years ago. His family, as well as the family of the late Senator Robert Taft, and my family, have spent many summers together at Murray Bay, in Canada, where we all became intimately acquainted.

I can say without hesitation that rarely, if ever, has a man appointed for so important a position as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court been so well equipped and trained as John Harlan. His professional qualifications have been attested by leading jurists in the courts of New York and by the most distinguished members of the bar.

I knew him as an undergraduate at Princeton, and I had the privilege of advising with him at the time when he was making up his mind about accepting the Rhodes scholarship to Oxford.

Mr. President, I am sincerely hopeful that the outstanding nomination of John Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States will today be confirmed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, my opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme

Court of the United States is based primarily upon three grounds:

First, the nominee would not agree to protect the sovereignty of the United States in the fight which now is being waged by powerful, organized pressure groups on the Atlantic seaboard to secure a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States that a treaty and rights secured thereunder would contravene and be paramount to the laws of the United States; that they would be paramount to the Constitution of the United States; and that by the provisions of a treaty an American citizen could be deprived of the rights guaranteed to him and protected by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

The issue here is whether the United States has surrendered its sovereignty; whether the United Nations Charter, with its taint of communism, is paramount to the United States Constitution; and whether citizens of the United States can be deprived by a world government of their sacred American rights of life and liberty. Our Supreme Court is now divided 4 to 4 on this, the greatest question which has ever confronted our country.

The question is simply this: Is the Constitution of the United States supreme? Are the rights of our people, guaranteed by that document, secure? Will we retain our form of government? I conceive it to be my paramount duty under my oath of office to protect and preserve the Constitution. With the peculiar situation of a divided court, the sole way this country can be protected and preserved is to require a nominee to the Supreme Court to state his views on this question, to state his views on the legal effect of a treaty. Surely the United States Senate and individual Senators have a right to know the views of a nominee for Justice of the Supreme Court on questions which involve the sovereignty of the United States and the preservation of our form of government. This question I shall discuss in detail a little later.

The fact is, however, that Judge Harlan declined to discuss the question. He declined to give his views. I therefore consider it my duty to oppose the confirmation of his nomination.

The second reason why I oppose the confirmation of this nomination is that the nominee lacks judicial experience, that this is a political appointment, dictated by Thomas E. Dewey and his henchmen, and that therefore the nomination should not be confirmed.

The third reason is that Judge Harlan is from the State of New York, and that the people of this great State possess views and philosophies which are different from those entertained by the rest of the country. New York has had entirely too many men in the Cabinets of Presidents, and entirely too many men upon the Supreme Court bench. It has had, and now has, entirely too much influence, for one State, upon the Government of the United States and the policies of our country. It is not good for our Government when too many Cabinet members and too many judges of our highest court are concentrated in one State.

The charge has been made that several southerners are opposed to the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan because 60 years ago his grandfather wrote a hostile, anti-Southern, dissenting opinion in a segregation case. This charge is, of course, absurd. It is made by the pressure groups to get votes for this nominee from the Northern and Western States. The reason these groups are supporting him is that they think he will rule in conformity with their views, to the effect that the United Nations Treaty and the United Nations Organization are paramount to the American Government and to the United States Constitution. They further feel that we can enter a world government by the negotiation and ratification of an Atlantic union treaty. In other words, they think he will break, in their favor, the present stalemate on the Supreme Court.

What kind of man is it who would vote against a nominee because of some decision made by his grandfather more than 60 years ago? I do not believe a single Senator would be influenced by such a fantastic consideration. The question of racial segregation has not entered into my decision to vote against confirmation.

There are certain things that even the Supreme Court cannot do. There are certain things which no court can accomplish. No court can compel people to associate socially with one another. No court can compel school integration in areas where it is violently opposed by both races. The recent school segregation decision and the decree which will be entered to implement it will not even begin to lay the groundwork for racial integration in the schools of the Deep South. When the final decree is entered the net result will be simply an intensification of the contempt held by many people of this country for the Court. It will merely intensify the view, held by a great many people, that the Court as now constituted is incompetent and is controlled by political pressure groups. There is nothing Judge Harlan could do to cause racial integration in the schools, even if he so desired.

Since the charge is made that the attitude of some of us is based on a segregation decision, because of what his grandfather is alleged to have done, I wish to show the fallacy of the charge, and to show that world government is really the issue in this case. I quote from the case of *Cummings* v. *County Board of Education* (175 U. S., p. 528), a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, and a decision which was written by Mr. Justice Harlan, the grandfather of the present nominee:

> The education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified, except in the case of a clear, unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land.

If I were to be influenced for or against a nominee by reason of something his grandfather said, I would certainly be influenced in favor of confirmation in this case, because of the position which Grandfather Harlan took in a school case before the Supreme Court 60 years ago.

I believe that Judge Harlan is an able lawyer. He has certainly been a successful lawyer. I think he is too smart and is too able an attorney to accept the views held by a number of Justices as to the effect of the 14th amendment to the Constitution in segregation matters. I do not believe he will be subject, in segregation cases, to pressure by organized pressure groups. I believe that he will follow what was evidently the intent of the Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution, and the real intent of those who framed and passed the 14th amendment.

Mr. President, I desire to be fair in this matter. Permit me to say for Judge Harlan that in my judgment, if confirmed, he will be the ablest lawyer on the Court. He will be an improvement over most of the Justices.

He would not give his views on treaty laws, but he did state—and I think he was correct in so stating—that he would not, if confirmed, accept cash annuities or awards from organizations which promote cases in the courts. I am sorry to say that that has occurred on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe that he would cite the law as he sees it, and would not rely for authority upon the writings of Communist-front sociologists and psychologists. He would not permit groups which promote legislation before the courts to lobby with him by giving him honorary dinners and "achievement" plaques. Again I am sorry to say that some Justices of the Supreme Court have been guilty of such things.

Mr. President, there is no complaint from me that Judge Harlan does not have the legal ability or the integrity for this high position. He does not have the judicial experience, but I am satisfied he has the legal ability. I believe he is a man of very high and unquestioned integrity. If his nomination is confirmed, I am confident there will never be the least question of his integrity, and there will never be the least question of unethical conduct, nor, as I have said, will pressure groups be able to influence him through cash awards and honorary dinners.

One of the primary reasons for the disrepute in which our high courts of appeals are now held is the lack of judicial experience of the individuals who are nominated to the bench. Eminent as Judge Harlan may be as a lawyer and trial attorney, he does not have sufficient judicial experience to qualify him for the Supreme Court.

It is my belief that the Justices appointed to the Supreme Court bench should be selected from among active judges on the Federal judiciary or those of the highest courts of the several States, and they should have served long enough to make a distinguished record.

Mr. President, it has been my observation for the past 20 years that in that time not one appointment to the Supreme Court was based upon outstanding legal ability or upon accomplishments as a great jurist. It is my opinion that political considerations have governed the selection of Supreme Court Justices

in both Democratic and Republican administrations. For that reason the Court finds itself at the low level it now occupies.

The complexities of modern civilization have increased to a great degree specialized activities by various members of the legal profession. Certainly a field that requires the highest degree of specialization and training is that of the judiciary. Judge Harlan's slight experience as a member of the Second Circuit of the United States Court of Appeals in no way gives him needed judiciary experience to meet the high requirements that should be set for the Supreme Court of the United States.

I am in favor of comprehensive legislation which would set the highest standards possible for qualification to nomination and appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States. Bills which have been introduced to this effect, and which were necessary for the welfare of the Nation, will receive my earnest consideration and hearty support.

Mr. President, the duty incumbent on members of the Judiciary Committee to subject nominees for high judicial posts to rigorous and minute examination and cross-examination is a very unpleasant and distasteful task. But the performance of this duty is a most solemn obligation we owe to our oaths of office and to the people of the United States. I regret the necessity of having had to subject Judge Harlan to this ordeal.

The evidence is clear and convincing that Judge Harlan is one of the truly outstanding members of the American bar. As a trial lawyer of long-time experience, he was probably without a peer in his field. Despite his widespread activity in many fields of legal endeavor, his record is above reproach and he has received universal acclaim and recommendation from his associates at the bar.

But, Mr. President, honest and honorable men can cleave to differences of opinion in the realm of ideas, and on political and legal philosophies that create chasms across which no bridge can span. It is on this plane that I base my unalterable opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan.

This character of opposition is not new and unprecedented in the Senate. In 1795 the nomination of John Rutledge of South Carolina for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was rejected. He had previously honorably served a 2-year term as an Associate Justice. The senior Senators from Georgia and Arizona will personally recall the great debate which took place over the nomination of Judge John J. Parker to the Supreme Bench in 1929. Judge Parker was then and is now one of the truly outstanding jurists of the 20th century. His character and reputation were above and beyond reproach, but his nomination was rejected by the Senate on the ground that he espoused a political or legal philosophy contrary to that held by a majority of the Senators then present and voting. It is interesting to note further Mr. President, that these alleged ideological differences referred solely and alone to the application of Federal laws within the framework of the Constitution. Of much greater importance and significance is an ideological difference that extends above and beyond the framework of the Constitution. It is on this basis that I must part ways with Judge Harlan.

Mr. President, previously I have reviewed—and I shall later, perhaps, do so in greater detail—the development of judicial decisions concerning the application of treaties to the domestic law of the United States and that of the several States. Prior to Judge Harlan's appearance before the committee, and after long and careful thought and consideration, I reached the conclusion that the sovereignty of our country was a vital and compelling issue that over-rode all consideration of personalities. While I disagree wholeheartedly and completely with Secretary Dulles' enunciation as to the effect of treaties on the Constitution and laws of the United States and the constitutions and internal laws of the several States, it is a self-evident fact that this pernicious doctrine is now being given widespread credence by responsible officials in the executive department of the Federal Government.

I shall read from a speech delivered by Secretary of State Dulles before the American Bar Association in the city of Louisville, Ky., on April 12, 1952.

I asked Judge Harlan what his views were on the pronouncement made by Secretary Dulles in that speech. Judge Harlan said he did not desire to comment.

Mr. President, it is the duty of the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the legal philosophy of a nominee. It is incumbent upon us as lawyers to make certain that a nominee is well grounded in the law. It is incumbent upon us to see that the laws are upheld. That has nothing to do with a specific case which would come before the court, and is certainly no reason for disqualification should such a case arise.

Mr. President, this man, who refused to talk, was supported by Dulles, Dewey, and Brownell. He is a member of the Atlantic Union Advisory Committee. He is a member of the United Nations Committee to promote the United Nations. He says he did not know what they meant. I have heard that before. He said if they mean what now he realizes is their true meaning and what they really stand for, he would dissociate himself from them, provided his nomination should be confirmed. I asked the question because he put that proviso in his answer—"provided my nomination is confirmed." I asked him if he thought he should have dissociated himself from them when he became a judge of the circuit court of appeals, and he said, when driven into a corner: "Yes, I believe I should."

Mr. President, here is what Secretary Dulles said:

> The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government, or to some international body.

Mr. President, there is the greatest issue which confronts 20th century America.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the same Mr. Dulles appeared before our committee and testified against the Bricker amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. Dulles goes further, and I hope Senators will listen to this:

> And they can cut across the rights given by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court is divided 4 to 4. I asked the nominee if, in his judgment, a treaty could deprive a citizen of the United States of rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, and he refused to answer. Why? I ask, again, Why?

He was asked if a treaty ratified by the Senate could deprive a citizen of rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and if a treaty is paramount to the Constitution, and his answer was, "I decline to answer."

Mr. President, if we are going to confirm the nominations of men who take such a position before the committee, we might as well abolish the right of the Senate to confirm judicial nominations. We have a duty and a right to know the legal philosophy of a man who is nominated to the Supreme Court bench. I know that every Senator will conscientiously discharge his duty, under his oath of office, as he sees it. I think it is my duty to vote against confirming the nomination of any man, regardless of who he may be, who will not answer such questions, because, after all, it is my primary responsibility, as I see it, under my oath, to protect the sovereignty of my country.

Mr. President, there is another angle. I am going to read part of a telegram from a great Texan, which will emphasize the point which bears upon this nominee's qualifications.

The nominee was asked about the Bricker amendment, one of the very important questions which confront the people of the United States at this time. Upon its solution, in my judgment, depends the whole future of the American form of government. I think that unless the Bricker amendment is submitted and ratified, the American system of government will be a thing of the past.

What was his answer? He said he did not know anything about the Bricker amendment; he did not know what it meant.

Mr. President, here is an able lawyer, a man who represented the Du Ponts in a great antitrust case, a man who was the senior partner of a great law firm, a man who was on the bench of the circuit court of appeals, a man who is highly educated, a graduate of Oxford University. He stated that he did not know what the Bricker amendment was.

Listen to this telegram, Mr. President:

I have come to the conclusion that Judge Harlan, a national and international lawyer, is one of the least-informed men I have ever heard of. There is scarcely a high-school boy or girl in Texas not familiar with the United Nations and the Atlantic Union.

I submit, Mr. President, that a nominee who says he knows nothing about a matter which is so important as is the Bricker amendment should not have his nomination confirmed; that we had better go slowly; and that we must go slowly is made double sure when we learn the organizations to which he belongs, and when we discover who were his associates behind his nomination for the United States Supreme Court. He is a product of the Dewey crowd. He is a product of Thomas E. Dewey and his political henchmen, one of whom came down from the city of New York, a very able lawyer, a very honorable man, and urged that the nomination of Judge Harlan be confirmed. It developed that he signed a brief in the Supreme Court for Alger Hiss, a brief which sought to get the Court to hold that the United Nations Charter could supplant laws of the States and could supplant the Constitution of the United States.

I say, Mr. President, we should consider his surroundings, his environment, his associates. Why were those people pushing this nomination for confirmation, and at the very time when our Supreme Court is divided, 4 to 4, on this great question? The issue involved is too grave to place on the basis of trust or speculation. In the field of political or legal philosophy a "yea" or a "nay" answer is required. The question was put squarely to Judge Harlan. He refused to say "Yea," and he refused to say "Nay." The character and nature of his evasive answers lends weight to the conclusion that he sides with those who would forfeit our sovereignty. This, plus what I will charitably term his "naivete" is being wholly oblivious to, and holding no opinion or convictions concerning, great public issues that characterize the life of our times.

Mr. President, examination of Judge Harlan's testimony will be in the reverse order from the delineation immediately set forth above.

Senator DANIEL. Judge Harlan, without causing you any embarrassment or any intended criticism of any person who might have commented on the subject, do you, as an individual citizen, have any views whatever on the subject of admission of Communist China to the United Nations?

Judge HARLAN. I have no views on it.

Here is a nominee to the Supreme Court who has absolutely no views on whether Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations. I submit that that is a circumstance which goes to the competence of the nominee, able lawyer and honorable man that he is. I continue to quote from the hearings:

Senator DANIEL. You have not expressed any views in international affairs since becoming a judge of the circuit court?

Judge HARLAN. I have not.

Senator DANIEL. Publicly?

Judge HARLAN. No, sir; or before.

Thus, a learned and intelligent man has no personal or private views on a public issue which has been the subject of widespread debate throughout our society from high-school civic classes to the Halls of the American Congress. An inquiring reported cannot get a satisfactory answer from a man on the street who does not have a fixed conviction one way or another. If the most intelligent, and supposedly best informed, citizens of the country can so disregard and be oblivious to such vital matters, wherein can there be hope for the survival of our Republic?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. I assume the Senator from Mississippi understands the reasoning behind my line of questioning of Judge Harlan, as to whether he had expressed himself regarding the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I understand.

Mr. DANIEL. My real interest was in determining whether or not Judge Harlan planned to go about over the country, expressing himself publicly on international affairs.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yielded for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. I merely wished to clarify the record. If the Senator objects——

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I do not object.

Mr. DANIEL. Since the Senator from Mississippi read some of the questions I asked Judge Harlan, I want to clarify the record here today.

My feeling about the matter is that a member of the Supreme Court of the United States should confine himself, as nearly as possible, to the business of the Court, and should not be taking sides publicly on important matters of foreign relations. I do not mean by these remarks to criticize any particular sitting member of the Court; it is simply a general principle with me. That is why I asked Judge Harlan the questions.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think the distinguished Senator from Texas is exactly correct. I think his position is sound.

The Senator has said he would not criticize any sitting member of the Court. However, I think one member of the Court is deserving of criticism, and I will certainly criticize him.

Mr. DANIEL. I will, too, at the proper time. I just did not mean to be criticizing by these remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will be critical. I will be guilty of it. I speak of a man who advocates and recommends the recognition of Communist China, a country whose government has murdered thousands of American boys.

Judge Harlan's answer was not that he had not gone over the country; his answer was that he had no opinion on whether Red China should be recognized or not. The point I make is that that goes to his competence.

Mr. DANIEL. I would have been better satisfied if Judge Harlan had had a personal opinion that Red China should not be admitted to the United Nations. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi on that point.

Furthermore, in other forums, I have disagreed with a sitting member of the Supreme Court on this matter. I said I had not intended to do so again here today, but since the Senator from Mississippi has raised the question and has himself expressed such disagreement, I will here and now join with the Senator in expressing my disagreement with and disapproval of a sitting member of the Court who has gone about over the country advocating the admission of Red China to the United Nations. I wanted to be certain that we would not have another member of the Supreme Court doing that, if the nomination of Judge Harlan were confirmed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think there will be another member of the Supreme Court doing that.

Does not the Senator from Texas believe that the same Justice who has been traveling throughout the country espousing pro-Communist causes, resorted to legal chicanery in an effort to save from execution two Communist spies?

Mr. DANIEL. I have not studied or formed an opinion on the question the Senator asks.

Mr. EASTLAND. Judge Harlan is a member of the American Bar Association and also a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. It was in 1948 that the American Bar Association, through its Committee on Peace and Law through the United Nations, began studying United Nations covenants. These studies culminated in a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates in February 1952, recommending an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify and pin down the treatymaking power contained in the Constitution. It was a subject of widespread discussion and debate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], also proposed a similar amendment, known as the Bricker amendment, in February 1952. When the battlelines were drawn, it developed that the Association of the Bar of the City of New York was the only bar association in the United States actively fighting the Bricker amendment. As all know, it has been one of the great debates of the mid-20th century. Yet Judge Harlan says:

Senator DIRKSEN. Judge Harlan, it was the Judiciary Committee and a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that took the testimony on the so-called Bricker proposal, and I suppose you followed it somewhat no doubt through the bar associations and the press at the time it was on the front page.

Judge HARLAN. Frankly, I did not, and I will tell you why. For the past 4 years, almost, before I came on the bench and left private practice, I have been so immersed in litigation, most of which has been out of town, that the normal things that one does under ordinary circumstances escape me, and frankly, I attended none of the meetings of the bar association, no meetings that I can ever remember discussing the question of the Bricker amendment, and read no literature on the subject. I neglected my family in other respects, so that it wasn't merely the—

Again I say that practically every schoolchild in the United States knew about the great fight which the senior

Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was making. It seems peculiar to me that that fact did not trickle down to this nominee, who is a great lawyer and an American of high intelligence. I continue to read:

Senator JENNER. I am glad to have your views in regard to this. Now, may I ask, what is your opinion of the Bricker amendment?

Judge HARLAN. I have no opinion about it because, as I testified before—and I think it was Senator DIRKSEN who asked me the question—it so happened that during the controversy about the Bricker amendment, I was heavily engaged in litigation to the point where the ordinary interest that any intelligent citizen has in the affairs of this country, whether he is active or inactive in politics, had to yield to the necessities of my professional commitments. Perhaps you weren't here when I said it.

Here, Mr. President, are two topics of great significance, such as to attract the "ordinary interest that any intelligent citizen has in the affairs of this country, whether he is active or inactive in politics." Yet, about them, Judge Harlan pleads ignorance or indifference. I submit that no man can live in this country in an absolute vacuum, particularly an astute and able lawyer, and not have some cognizance of the public issues of the day.

According to Judge Harlan, his lack of understanding extends to acts of commission as well as those of omission. The opposition to his nomination stemmed from his alleged connection with the Atlantic Union Committee. He was reported as having been a member of the advisory council of this organization since 1952. The report was absolutely correct. But, after holding a post on the advisory council for a period of 3 years, Judge Harlan not only stated that he took no part in the organization's activities, but now denies that he understood the purposes of the organization that he joined, and upon being advised as to what its purposes were, disassociated himself completely from those purposes, and repudiated them.

Two of the purposes contained in the articles of incorporation of the Atlantic Union Committee are:

2. To promote a widespread understanding of the principles and advantages of a federal union of free peoples so as to make possible a fair evaluation of any plan that may be recommended by such convention, and to proffer advice and assistance in formulating the terms on which any such union is to be established.

I read further:

3. To promote the formation of such a union of democracies as, in the opinion of the committee, offers the best prospect for attaining world peace.

What constituted the opinion of the committee is covered in this address in setting forth Justice Robert's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950. What did Judge Harlan know and think about all this? He explained that he received a letter from Justice Roberts, whom he did not know personally, which letter said in part, as appears in the hearings:

"MARCH 29, 1952.

"DEAR MR. HARLAN: The Atlantic Union Committee has authorized me, as president, to invite you to join us in our effort to underwrite the safety of freemen."

Judge HARLAN. I might parenthesize at that point to say that Mr. Osborne was one of the commissioners of the crime commission, which you heard discussed yesterday, for which I had recently been at this time the counsel. Continuing with the letter:

"Mr. Lithgow Osborne has suggested to me that you might be interested in our work. We want you among the 500 other distinguished American leaders who comprise the membership of our council.

"Specifically, the job of the Atlantic Union Committee is to support mutual-security measures which can help the Atlantic community grow into a union of the West, with some form of common authority. In this way it will give the United States power to enforce peace."

Let me interpolate to say that under that common authority and common citizenship, our immigration laws would be swept away.

I continue to read the letter and testimony:

"Your acceptance of this invitation to join our council will mean two things: First, you will be alining yourself with leaders in the free world who believe that aggression and war can be deterred by determined, collective action.

"Secondly, you will be acting on your own convictions by joining a group that is translating this theory into practice through supporting legislation moving toward union of democracies."

To which I replied on April 31, as follows:

"MY DEAR JUDGE ROBERTS: I am glad to accept your invitation to become a member of the council of the Atlantic Union Committee. I feel, however, that I should warn you that I cannot be counted on for any work or activity in connection with the committee for the next year, owing to an antitrust litigation in which I am engaged."

Judge HARLAN. That, gentlemen of the committee, that is of the Judiciary Committee, is the full extent of my participation in the Atlantic Union.

Senator EASTLAND. Judge, the letter spoke of an international authority, and you had an invitation to join that authority. What did you understand about the international authority that the invitation asked you to join?

Judge HARLAN. I regarded that letter, Senator EASTLAND, as indicating some kind of collective action that would represent the group of so-called American democracies in a collective effort to combat the Communist menace, that was all.

At a later point in the testimony, Judge Harlan said in part:

And I also said, which I again want to make clear, so that it does not leave any false implication, that since this thing has come up, I have heard nothing and have no reason to believe that the Atlantic Union stands for any such thing as has been pictured here, or that the objectives of the union are different from the premises that I told Judge Roberts I would join it on, namely, as an instrument in the defense of the Atlantic community against the Communist threat.

Still later, he said:

Judge HARLAN. I might also add that I have said, which I still believe to be the case, that I have found nothing, even though my connection with the Atlantic Union was purely formal, I have found nothing that I have heard since that indicates the Atlantic Union stands for any different set of principles than the premise on which I felt I would join it.

At one point the chairman asked him:

The CHAIRMAN. Just a second, I want to ask one question to clarify something.

There is one thing you said that is a little bit unclear, I think, that within your knowledge the Atlantic Union had nothing to interfere with your ideas. By that do you mean that there is nothing in the Atlantic Union policies that in your opinion would in any way affect the sovereignty of the United States as a sovereign nation of the world?

Judge HARLAN. That is why I have always understood the Atlantic Union.

Judge Harlan admits that he knew the Atlantic Union Committee would be a subject of controversy at the hearings. He went through his files to get the correspondence. As a great trial lawyer, could he ever have prepared and won a case with such an abysmal ignorance of his facts and an absolute inattention to any detail? Here, on a matter so important that it shakes the foundation of the Constitution itself, he pleads guilty.

I read further:

Senator JENNER. But I take it, since Judge Harlan here has become a member of the Atlantic Union, so to speak, on the advisory committee, through a direct invitation of Justice Owen Roberts—in other words, I would like to know, Judge Harlan, how far would the proposed Atlantic Union reduce American sovereignty, if you know?

Judge HARLAN. Well, I just can't tell you because I don't—I wouldn't suppose at all, because I don't understand that their objectives are to undermine the Constitution of the United States.

Senator JENNER. Well, let me give you, as I understand it, some of the objectives sustained by Justice Roberts of the Atlantic Union:

"Such a union must be built on, first, a common citizenship; second, a common economic and military policy; third, a common currency; fourth, a free exchange of goods and services among federation members." Now, that is Justice Roberts' statements on what are the proposals of the Atlantic Union.

Judge HARLAN. Well, I——

Senator JENNER. And that would affect the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, and the Benelux countries in the original proposal.

Judge HARLAN. Well, I can't——

Senator JENNER. But they also have literature out that would eventually, by consent of the original members of the Atlantic Union, provide that they could bring in the rest of the world.

Now, I realize that I am inquiring into a political philosophy, but I think that we are at such a juncture in history, before a man is confirmed to the highest court in this land—

Mr. President, let me say I certainly agree with the position taken at that point by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]—

this committee, through the representative form of government—and I am here representing the people of my State and I hope the people of the Nation—I would like your honest views on your political philosophy on that kind of proposition, common currency, and so forth.

Judge HARLAN. I will give you my honest view.

Senator JENNER. All right, sir.

Judge HARLAN. This is the first time, unless it was read yesterday, that I have ever heard that statement read. If Justice Roberts is correctly quoted, and the implication that you draw from what is said there is correct, I disassociate myself from it, because I don't believe in it.

And again, later:

Senator DANIEL. As a predicate to some questions on that subject, I would like to read from a document I obtained at the Library of Congress, Twenty Questions on Atlantic Union, published by the Atlantic Union Committee, from page 3 following, which I will dictate into the record:

"We would transfer to the union government certain definitely limited portions of powers presently delegated to our National Government.

* * * * *

"Proponents of the Atlantic Union have, however, pointed out that in existing Federal unions, like the United States, the people have delegated to the union government powers to establish a common foreign policy, a common defense, a common free market, a common currency, a common postal system, a common citizenship, and also a sufficient power of taxation to implement these other powers. Justice Roberts has suggested—"

And I am now reading from page 4 of this document—

"that an Atlantic union government should comprise a legislature, probably of two houses elected by the union's people, an executive capable of enforcing the union laws upon its citizens, and a judiciary empowered to adjudicate union laws."

That is an international supreme court, Mr. President; and Judge Harlan was a member of the advisory committee to promote such a setup. When pinned down, he said he did not know it stood for that.

Mr. President, I do not think it is good policy to confirm the nomination of a man who joins such an organization and, when he sees that the objectives of the organization would not meet with the approval of a majority of the United States Senate, says, "I am ignorant about it, and I dissociate myself from it." I have heard such statements made too many times by persons who have joined a great many organizations which later turned out to be "front" organizations; when they found Communists there, those persons have said, "I did not know it, and I dissociate myself."

That situation has been bitterly condemned and, I think, rightly so, year in and year out by Members on the Republican side of the aisle. But now the shoe is on the other foot.

I read further, continuing the statement made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]:

Now, as I understand it, at the time that you consented to become a member of the advisory board of the Atlantic Union, you did not know that these were proposals of the Atlantic Union Committee.

Judge HARLAN. That is correct, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And you disassociate yourself with any such proposals?

Judge HARLAN. I do, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Now, from page 16 of the same document I read into the record the following:

"By the process of voluntary growth, the union could at some time in the indefinite future develop into a free world government." At the time that you consented to become a member of the board, you did not know that that was a statement, at least, contained in the official publications of the Atlantic Union Committee?

Judge HARLAN. That is correct, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And you disassociate yourself with any such plan or proposal.

Judge HARLAN. I do.

Senator DANIEL. Now, are you still a member of the advisory board of the Atlantic Union?

Judge HARLAN. So far as I know.

Mr. President, before I make any additional comments, let me point out Judge Harlan's admitted connection with still another organization.

Senator EASTLAND. You have never been a member of any United Nations organization?

Judge HARLAN. Yes; I have. I am a member of the Citizens Association of the United Nations, I think. Never attended any meetings. My membership goes to the extent of going to one meeting and hearing a speech made, and sending in $25 contribution.

Senator EASTLAND. What is the object of the Citizens Association for the United Nations?

Judge HARLAN. Frankly, I cannot tell you. I think I went with a friend to a cocktail party one afternoon. I think the purpose of it is simply to engender interest in the United Nations—that is all.

Mr. President, I submit there are in this country very few persons who will join an organization and will make a contribution of $25 to promote it, but will have no idea what its objectives are. I was amazed when I heard that statement by the nominee.

Mr. President, I have been unable to find a listing of any such organization as the Citizens Association for the United Nations. Since the American Association for the United Nations, which concentrates its activities in New York, and about which I have spoken at great length, is the only one of any consequence in that area with a similar name, it must be assumed that this is the organization to which he is referring.

Judge Harlan says he thinks the purpose of it is simply to engender interest in the United Nations. I say that the evidence is clear and convincing that its purpose is to undermine and destroy the sovereignty of the United States. We need no further proof than the amicus curiae brief, previously discussed, which it filed in the case of Shelly V. Kramer. We certainly hold to different points of view. My viewpoint is based on facts. Judge Harlan's is probably based on ignorance.

I shall read the arguments in the brief which was filed by this organization, the American Association for the United Nations, to which Judge Harlan evidently belonged, and to which he evidently made a $25 contribution. The brief is signed, among others, by Alger Hiss, Asher Bob Lans, Phillip C. Jessup—I remember that the Senate refused to confirm the nomination of Mr. Jessup at one time—Joseph M. Proskauer, who was the principal witness for the nominee; Myers S. McDougal, and Victor Elting, of counsel.

Mr. McDougal was a schoolmate of mine. He is a very distinguished professor at Yale University, and I think a very misguided liberal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator give us his definition of a "misguided liberal"?

Mr. EASTLAND. We will go into that.

The arguments in the brief are summarized:

I. Enforcement of racial restrictive covenants is a violation of articles 55 (c) and 56 of the treaty known as the United Nations Charter.

(a) Interpretation of articles 55 (c) and 56.

(b) The obligations of the United States under articles 55 and 56 are not qualified by article 2, paragraph 7 thereof.

II. As a part of the supreme law of the land treaties invalidate conflicting provisions of State common law or State statutes.

III. Both State and Federal courts are prohibited from taking affirmative action which contravenes the declared foreign policy of the United States of eliminating racial and religious discrimination.

The Supreme Court decided this case on other grounds. But the position taken by the authors and proponents of this brief is clear and unequivocal.

While Alger Hiss signed this brief as an attorney, he is not listed as a member of the Board of Directors or an officer of the American Association for the United Nations. Let me say in deference to Judge Harlan that he said he was a member of the Citizens Association for the United Nations. My information is that there is no such organization, and that the only one is the association which filed this brief.

Mr. Eichelberger, the executive director of the American Association for the United Nations, explained Mr. Hiss' connection with the brief in this language:

It is the first name and it would be proper to read the list, but in case anyone reads the record in the future and wonders, I want to make it clear, I want to make it clear no one is stressing that. Mr. Hiss at that time was president of the Carnegie Foundation and a member of the Board of International Nations. Certainly no question has been raised as to his patriotism. He asked to sign the brief although he had little to do with its preparation. That was before any question was raised as to Mr. Hiss.

Mr. President, the point is that this organization filed a brief in the court, which stated:

As a part of the supreme law of the land treaties invalidate conflicting conditions of State common law or State statutes.

Here again we have the question as to the competence and qualifications of this nominee.

How did Judge Harlan get into the Atlantic Union business? Justice Roberts says his good friend Mr. Lithgow Osborne recommended him. Judge Harlan described Mr. Osborne as one of the commissioners of the New York Crime Commission, for which he served as counsel. He omitted the fact that Mr. Lithgow Osborne is also the national secretary of the Atlantic Union Committee of which Justice Roberts is President. Certainly, Mr. Osborne knew and knows exactly and accurately what the Atlantic Union Committee stands for and what has been contained in the literature.

As I have stated, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, of New York City, appeared before the committee to testify for Judge Harlan, not only as a representative of the New York County Lawyers Association, but also as a long-time friend of Judge Harlan. This is the Judge Proskauer whom I previously described as

being at the San Francisco convention, where the United Nations was organized, and making the inspiring speeches for the insertion of articles 55 and 56 into the United Nations Charter. This is also the Judge Proskauer who signed the brief amicus curiae in the Shelly versus Kramer case along with Alger Hiss, Phillip Jessup, and others whom I have named. Mrs. Joseph M. Proskauer is listed as a member of the board of directors for the American Association for the United Nations.

Mr. Wendell Berge, formerly an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, appeared at the hearings to testify for Judge Harlan on his own behalf. He explained that as a law clerk he worked under Judge Harlan's supervision for 2 years and that Judge Harlan was an inspiration to all who came in contact with him. Later the judge had litigation with the Government in fields in which Mr. Berge represented the Government. Mr. Berge—and this is strange—is or was also a member of the advisory council of the Atlantic Union Committee.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary was besieged by members of this advisory committee, by people who were interested in one-world government, and who were advocating the confirmation of this man's nomination. I submit that that is a circumstance which should weigh heavily.

The Chicago Tribune, in a long editorial opposing Judge Harlan's appointment, summed up his testimony in regard to these organizations in this manner:

> A lot of Communists and members of Communist fronts have testified that they were so simple minded that they never knew that they were being used for revolutionary purposes. It is difficult to credit their testimony as to Communist fronts; it is difficult to credit Judge Harlan's as to one-world fronts.

Mr. President, at great length and in detail, I have analyzed the attitudes and actions of organizations, and the members thereof, devoted to the principle of supergovernments. Judge Harlan, himself, was forced to admit publicly that they did seek to destroy sovereignty now vested in the Constitution of this Republic. He attempted to repudiate these purposes. Now, on the basis of his own testimony, he must be indicted in the words of Jefferson for—

> combining with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws.

The people, who are the final reservoir of our strength and power, are awake to the assaults that are now being made on the Constitution. If the Senate does not perform its constitutional duty in protecting the Constitution, the issue will ultimately be determined at the polls. But determined it shall be, and I, for one, have no doubt about the eventual outcome.

Mr. President, please indulge me while I make a more detailed analysis of Judge Harlan's testimony in regard to treaty law. As my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] said, that is a great question that confronts this country.

I read to Judge Harlan Secretary Dulles' statement on treaty law, which I have previously quoted in full, and asked this question:

> Now, I would like to have you tell us, please, sir, whether you agree or disagree with that statement, whether a treaty can cut across the Bill of Rights, whether it can override the Constitution of the United States, and whether under a treaty, rights given under the treaty will be paramount to the domestic laws of the State.
>
> Judge HARLAN. I will try to answer that question as fully and directly as I can, Senator EASTLAND, bearing in mind, which I am sure the committee respects, the position that I am in as a nominee to the Supreme Court of the United States, for I take it not only would the committee agree with me that it would be inappropriate for me to comment upon cases that may come before me, and to express my views on issues that may come before me, but that if I undertook to do so that would seem to me to constitute the gravest kind of question as to whether I was qualified to sit on that great Court. But in those limitations I will give an answer to your question, sir.

Let me say that it would be inappropriate for a judge to comment on cases which might come before him. But that is not the question here. He was asked solely and simply his view on a point of law. I submit it is not only within our power but it is within our duty as Senators to get that information.

> Senator EASTLAND. All right, sir.
>
> Judge HARLAN. First of all, as to the scope of the treatymaking power which has a long history, stemming from the original adoption of our Constitution, as you gentlemen know, as well as I do, those involved questions which have been before the Supreme Court, which are likely to come again before the Supreme Court in one fashion or another, and as to that I must ask your indulgence in saying that I would not in my position be entitled to comment on that. That is point 1.
>
> I have not finished my answer sir.
>
> Point 2: I think I can say with propriety that whatever the law is as a result of further congressional action with respect to the treatymaking power, either by constitutional amendment or otherwise, I would conceive it as my duty on the Court to enforce the Constitution and the law made by Congress as it appeared to me was the congressional intent of such legislation or constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, if any further proof was needed as to the impelling necessity to pass a constitutional amendment, such as the Bricker amendment, to spell out the scope of the treatymaking power, we have it here. A great jurist refuses pointblank to vouchsafe any opinion as to what our Constitution now means in respect to the scope, extent, or meaning of the treatymaking powers. Yet, he adds, "if you enact an amendment, if you pass legislation, I promise you I will do my utmost to carry out the congressional intent."

To continue with the testimony:

> Senator EASTLAND. Well, now, sir, we have an obligation, Judge, which is to protect the sovereignty of our country, and that is especially true in the light of the split decision of our Supreme Court, and I think that it is my duty to determine whether or not a man who is nominated, who becomes a member of the Highest Court in the land, would participate in a decision by which this country would lose its sovereignty.
>
> I would like to ask you, in the light of that, this question now: Can a treaty take powers from the State and give them to an international body, as the Secretary of State says it can?

Who questions the fact that a Member of the United States Senate is not entitled to an answer to that question? There is no such case before him. Can a treaty take powers from the State and give them to an international body, as the Secretary of State says it can?

> Judge HARLAN. For the reasons, Senator EASTLAND, that I have given, I do not think I can amplify the statement I have made or that it would be proper for me to do so, and I will have to stand on my previous answer with this addition, that I fully recognize the responsibility of your committee to scrutinize the candidate.
>
> Senator EASTLAND. Each individual Senator to make up his mind?
>
> Judge HARLAN. I entirely agree with that and am in full sympathy with it. I am not one of those who believes that the Senate Judiciary Committee should be a rubber-stamp in exercising its constitutional responsibility in participating in nominations. I am not of that school of thought, and that is why I am here. By the same token, I am sure that the members of the committee would recognize that under our scheme of things that a nominee to high judicial office would commit the gravest indiscretion, and I may add, impropriety, in expressing views as to how he would vote on issues that have not yet come before him and may come before as a member of the Court. And all I can say by way of amplification, with what I have said as to my own attitude on these questions, that I am not one of those who believe in any organization, the purpose of which is to override the Constitution of the United States, to surrender one iota of its sovereignty, and that the relationships that we must necessarily have in this complicated world and dangerous situation, are relationships which must be achieved and which can be achieved and were intended to be achieved within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, of course, it would be fully in accord with the Constitution if a fifth man on the Supreme Court, which is now divided 4 to 4, should hold that a treaty could surrender a right guaranteed under the Bill of Rights and could deprive the American Government of power vested in it by the Constitution and transfer it to some international body.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Mississippi does not mean to say, does he, that, in his opinion, such a decision would be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States or the intention of the writers of the Constitution?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. What Judge Harlan said was that he would not override the Constitution. But if the Court should hold that under the Constitution of the United States there can be negotiated and ratified a treaty which would deprive citizens of their rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, it would be perfectly constitutional.

Mr. DANIEL. That would be based on a new interpretation of the Constitution which might be made by the Court.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. But no such interpretation should ever be made. I wonder if the Senator will yield for an observation as to the importance of a constitutional amendment on this subject being emphasized by Judge Harlan's testimony?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall yield for a comment, of course, if I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. On this point the only thing on which I might disagree with the Senator is this: Judge Harlan said the question might come before the Court in the future and he would not undertake to answer the interrogatory because, if he did, he might at some time have to disqualify himself. He might have been justified in declining to answer for that reason. But I agree with the Senator that if it is a sufficiently close question as to whether a treaty might override the Constitution—so close that a nominee to the Supreme Court should not express himself on the question—then it makes out a good case for some type of constitutional amendment along the line of the Bricker amendment. The question should be resolved so that in the future no court could decide that a treaty could override express provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator from Texas. But, Mr. President, the Bricker amendment was not adopted; it was defeated. I shall discuss in a moment the Iowa case, in which the Supreme Court was divided, 4 to 4. If this nomination is confirmed, Judge Harlan will have the deciding vote. I know of no other way to protect the sovereignty of the United States than to force any man, not only Judge Harlan but any other man who is nominated to the Court, to state his views on treaty law.

Mr. DANIEL. So long as there is sufficient doubt as to cause a nominee to decline, on grounds of propriety, to answer the question, there certainly seems to be need for some type of amendment which will make it clear that a treaty cannot override the express provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly think so. I agree with the Senator entirely. I hope we can succeed in having such an amendment adopted.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. In other words, the Constitution of the United States provides for the ratification of treaties. Is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. The Constitution itself provides for the way in which treaties shall be ratified. Once ratified, they are the supreme law of the land. Is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JENNER. Therefore, unless Congress takes back the power it has given away, it would not matter whether Judge Harlan or any other man should be on the bench, he would have to rule that Congress, by political action, gave away our rights under the Constitution when we ratified the United Nations Treaty. That is the crossroads where we stand today. No one but the Congress itself can change the situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me ask the Senator from Indiana a question. With a court divided as is the Supreme Court—and as the Senator knows the Bricker amendment was not adopted—how can this country be preserved, if what the Senator says is true, unless a man who is nominated for a position on the Supreme Court tells the committee how he stands on this subject?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has answered the question himself by saying that this country cannot be preserved unless we take back the power we have given away by ratifying international treaties. It would not make any difference whether Harlan is on the Supreme Court, a treaty is the supreme law of the land, and Congress needs to wake up and take action. I say, the sooner the better.

Mr. EASTLAND. This nominee, if his nomination be confirmed, will have the deciding vote. He will determine that question, and the Senate does not know how he stands.

Mr. JENNER. We have a pretty good indication from the organizations to which he belonged. The sooner the question comes up the sooner the Congress and the people of the United States will awaken to the fact that the Nation has been placed in a boobytrap and our rights have been destroyed by the political action which weak-kneed men on the floor of the Senate of the United States took in ratifying that kind of a treaty. I say the sooner the better.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What question did the Senator say would have to be decided?

Mr. EASTLAND. This nominee will have a deciding voice with reference to the principles of law at issue.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to the Constitution itself, is it not clear from the very language of the Constitution that it provides that a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Therefore it has constitutional backing. That question does not have to be decided.

Mr. EASTLAND. On a mere general statement such as that, of course not.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, those of us who supported the Bricker amendment—and I am one of them—have been contending all the time that the Constitution itself provides that a treaty is the supreme law of the land.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me tell the Senator from Utah that I am not willing to agree that under the treaty power the laws of a State can be supplanted; that under the treaty power the rights guaranteed under the Bill of Rights can be taken from an American citizen. I do not agree to any such thing. I do not believe in such a thing. I say the present Supreme Court is divided 4 to 4, and that this man will have the determining vote.

Mr. WATKINS. Unless we concede that a treaty is the supreme law of the land, there is very little merit to the contention for the Bricker amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course not. There is a great fight. There is a group which is trying to get the Court to adopt that theory. Then the Bricker amendment entered the field of executive agreements.

Mr. WATKINS. We were trying to do what had already been done.

Mr. EASTLAND. What we were trying to do was to prevent what the Supreme Court is on the verge of doing.

Mr. WATKINS. What we were trying to do was to amend the Constitution so that it would not say, in effect, that treaties are the supreme law of the land.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but that is a general statement. It do not say that by a treaty a citizen can be deprived of fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. WATKINS. In my opinion, the only way in which that objective can be achieved is by an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Article VI of the Constitution provides as follows:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question now before the Senate, in connection with the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan, is whether or not, with the Supreme Court divided 4 to 4, the nominee, if he shall take his seat, will decide that a treaty shall take precedence over the Constitution and laws of the United States and the constitutions and laws of the various States.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Based upon his testimony and his background, I think he ought to be able to make up his mind which way he will decide such a case.

Mr. EASTLAND. Judge Harlan belongs to all the organizations which are promoting the doctrine that treaties take precedence over the Constitution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose the Bricker amendment were adopted. Sooner or later it would come before the Supreme Court of the United States for interpretation.

I think the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is familiar with the fact that when it comes to an interpretation of a clause in the Constitution, the final decision rests in the hands of the 9 members of the Supreme Court.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Let us take, for example, the Steel Seizure case, a case recently decided, and one which is discussed quite often. As I remember, the

decision in that case was 5 to 3. Five members of the Court held one way; three members held the other way.

So if the Bricker amendment were adopted, 5 members of the Supreme Court might interpret it in 1 way, while 4 members might say it meant somethig else. Therefore, what five members say is controlling. That is why the question of the confirmation of this nomination is so important.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I shall now discuss the Iowa decision, which is reported in 245 Iowa 147, 60 N. W. (2d) 110. The wife of the deceased, Sgt. John Rice, an eleven-sixteenths Winnebago Indian, entered into a contract with the cemetery for a burial lot. The contract included a clause which stated that "burial privileges accrue only to members of the Caucasian race." A funeral was held, but the cemetery refused to have the body lowered into the grave and had it removed from the grave site. Mrs. Rice was a Caucasian, and the cemetery claimed it did not know when the contract was entered into that the husband was eleven-sixteenths Winnebago Indian.

Mrs. Rice filed suit in a district court. It was the opinion of the lower court that the cause of action was originally premised upon a breach of contract with an allegation of damages based on the humiliation and mental distress occasioned by, first, the removal of the body from the grave site; and, second, a pamphlet published by the cemetery which sought to justify its action. The case was not tried on the merits. On motion by both parties for an adjudication on the points of law, the district judge found for the cemetery and Mrs. Rice appealed.

The Supreme Court of Iowa upheld the findings of the lower court. The district court had held that the United Nations Charter had no effect on the legality or illegality of the clause or in the rights of the parties under the contract. The Supreme Court of Iowa upheld this position with the following statement:

(4) It will suffice to say that that treaty has no application to the private conduct of individual citizens of the United States. It is true a principle was enunciated in that treaty but claims or fears that State laws have been abrogated by the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, have been dissolved by the California and Michigan courts. In *Sipes* v. *McGhee* (316 Mich. 614, 25 N. W. 2d 644), a case reviewed by the United States Supreme Court, there was a reversal on constitutional grounds but no criticism of the State court's expression as to the general law relative to treaties. The Michigan court said: "We do not understand it to be a principle of law that a treaty between sovereign nations is applicable to the contractual rights between citizens of the United States when a determination of these rights is sought in the courts. So far as the instant case is concerned, these pronouncements (art. 55, 56, United Nations Charter) are merely indicative of a desirable social trend and an objective devoutly to be desired by all well-thinking peoples." With this statement we agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may yield to me for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that following the quorum call and a brief recess in order to receive the Prime Minister of Australia, the Senator from Mississippi will again have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Mundt
Beall	Green	Murray
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Pastore
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Bush	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Humphrey	Purtell
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

RECESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. ROBERT GORDON MENZIES, PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Chair appoints the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as a committee to escort the Prime Minister of Australia into the Chamber.

The Honorable Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, entered the Chamber and took the seat assigned to him immediately in front of the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, it is my great privilege to present to you the Prime Minister of Australia. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Prime Minister MENZIES. Sir, it is a very remarkable experience for me to be allowed to speak in this place for the second time. As I said somewhere else about a similar matter, it is rather flattering, because the first time the invitation might have been accidental, but the second time it must be deliberate.

I also, sir, remember that on a former occasion when I spoke here, in 1950, I felt that I had had a busy day, because, in my innocence, I thought I would make one speech; but then I discovered, still in my innocence, that I would have to make two. And then I was taken off by Senator Connally to a luncheon of the Foreign Affairs and/or Foreign Relations Committee, and I found I had to make three speeches.

But, sir, I welcome this opportunity, not because I want to inflict a speech upon Senators, but because I think it affords a splendid occasion to say to the Senate of the United States something from Australia.

I do not suppose that any parliamentary assembly in the world has had such responsibilities to carry in the past 10 years as has this one. You have had the privilege and the responsibility of accepting toward other portions of the free world the most remarkable obligations; and to accept those, you have had to exhibit a willingness to place burdens—heavy burdens—on your own people. I am politician enough, after all my years of politics, to know that is not the easiest thing in the world. But you have done it.

One of the astonishing things, one of the cynical things, perhaps, in the world is that every now and then there are encountered people who have received benefits who rather resent it, who rather resent having some feeling of obligation to someone else. That must, as it comes back to you occasionally, make you feel somewhat irritated. But I should like to say, on behalf of Australia, that we have nothing but admiration, nothing but gratitude, for the magnificent magnanimity and leadership which you have given to the world. [Applause.]

Sir, there is one other thing I should like to say: We are free people. We engage in political conflicts. From a close perusal of the newspapers in the past few days, I have gathered that they are not unknown, even here. [Laughter.] But we in Australia carry them on with what Winston Churchill once described as a fine 18th century fervor; and your politicians, too, can strike blows and receive blows with gusto. But the point about it all is that we do all these things within the framework of freedom; and because we attach importance to that freedom, it is of the essence that we look around the world so that we may have great friends or small friends in the defense of freedom, in the defense of the right to disagree without execution. [Applause.]

In the case of Australia, we have great friends. We are, in terms of population, a small country—as small as you once were—and with a continent in front of us to develop somewhat larger than your own. Therefore, no one else is so well

fitted to understand us and our aspirations and our problems as you are, for in the course of your own national history you have solved your problems, and now find yourselves in a position where not only is the world affected by what you do or say, but in a large degree the free world depends vitally upon you. The day will no doubt come when some other, some future Prime Minister of Australia, may stand in this very room and find himself speaking, not for 9 million people, but for 50 million; and provided they are free people and sound people, he will be able to come here as a friend and meet friends.

One thing, however, disturbs me, and I hope I do not trespass too much on the hospitality of your time. The enemy—I shall not need define that expression with any more precision—has a superb technique of divide and conquer. The enemy is very astute to seize upon every point of difference among the governments of free countries, and magnify them from being points of difference into being vast areas of conflict, hoping that in that way he will produce misunderstandings, produce divisions, induce some great government to adopt irrevocably a policy unacceptable to another great government, so that we will be divided at the very time when we ought to be in a state of unity. I am constantly saying to other people and to myself, "We must watch this. We must keep our friendships in repair. We must not allow them to be destroyed or dissipated by this technique of divide and conquer." I believe that the points of difference among the free peoples of the world are trivial—so trivial that I will venture to say, not for the first time, that if we were contemplating—as we all are, but hoping to avoid it, of course, by honorable means—if we were contemplating a great world war in the defense of freedom, you would know, I would know, everyone in Great Britain would know, all around the free world we would know, that we would all be in it together.

Sir, that is the vital fact; and if we know, if we believe, that we must all stand together if we come to that challenge, then I think we should conduct all our discussions on the footing that if we are to be together, we must be together as tolerant, understanding friends, so that our differences, when looked at, may be dissipated, and the marvelous, underlying unities emphasized.

Now, sir, with your permission, one final observation. I said something about the Communist technique of divide and conquer. No more subtle propaganda is going on in the world today—we hear it, you hear it, all around the free world in my travels I have heard it—than propaganda against the United States of America—because in all these matters, as you know, you are regarded as the chief offender. Thank heaven you exist; but you are regarded as the chief offender. The Communists say, "What are they doing? They are propping up some outworn regime, some discredited government." I hear this everywhere; and I find it necessary to say to people, and I think we shall all find it necessary to say to people, "Put that nonsense out of your minds. What we are defending in our various countries and under our various agreements is not some man, not some government, but the freedom of the people of that country. If they are to change their government, they must be allowed to change it in their own way. If they are to adopt new philosophies, they must adopt them in their own way. But we are not going to accept a position in which, by force from without, these people are converted into being the slaves of some new tyranny. It is freedom for which we stand—not some man or some administration."

I think that needs to be known, needs to be preached, and needs to be clearly understood all over the world.

Sir, so far as we in Australia are concerned—British as we are, and proud member of the British Commonwealth as we are—we have with your great country, as a result of war, as well as of peace, a tie which I believe to be unbreakable; a profound sense of gratitude for all you have so splendidly done for the world; and—if I may add it, sir—a degree of affectionate, simple understanding which I do not believe can be surpassed between any two countries of the world. [Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] to respond on behalf of the majority to the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, and my colleagues in the Senate, it is a very great pleasure to welcome to this historic Chamber today a great leader of a valiant ally in World War II. Australians endeared themselves to all Americans when they received our boys in the dark days, the early days of World War II, on their land and in their homes, and when they stood side by side with them in fighting a ruthless foe.

Mr. Prime Minister, we are grateful for your stimulating and inspiring statements to us. We hope that you may enjoy your visit to our country. We all are looking forward to another visit with you.

If a personal reference may be pardoned, I had the very great pleasure of spending the first 4 or 5 months of World War II in your country, and on an island adjoining your country. I always felt that if I could not return to Texas, I knew where I wanted to go. That was Australia.

We hope you will say to your people that we appreciate their friendship. We realize that in unity there is strength, and so far as Australia and America are concerned, we know that the bonds of unity bind us together. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] is recognized to respond for the minority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, and my colleagues: I think you can see, Sir, by the warmth of the greeting which comes to you from both sides of the aisle, that your welcome here is indeed bipartisan in character, and represents the feeling not only of the Members of this body, but also of the American people as a whole.

You have mentioned the close ties which bind our two Nations together. We welcome you as the representative of a great people and a great government from "Down Under." In the early days of our own life as a free nation we had an expression, a sentiment was uttered to the effect that we would either hang together or we would hang separately. I believe that is meeting the challenge which confronts the free world today, the nations which believe in human freedom—nations in the far Pacific, in Europe, in the Middle East, and in the Americas—must recognize that in facing the menace of global communism we all must hang together or hang separately. I think we shall find no stouter ally than the great people of Australia and the British Commonwealth. I hope that our ties of friendship may endure for a thousand years. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows that Members of the Senate would like to meet the Prime Minister personally, and opportunity will be afforded for them to do so.

The Chair would like to state that a little more than a year ago it was his privilege to visit the Parliament in Canberra and to be entertained at a parliamentary luncheon.

Many ties bind together the people of Australia and those of the United States. One of those, which is the strongest, is our common belief in the parliamentary system of government. However, there are some differences. Today we had the privilege of hearing the Prime Minister of Australia speak. I had the privilege of hearing him participate in the question period in Parliament. I wish our rules were such that we could observe him under questioning from Members of this body. I assure Senators that he responds to questions with an aptitude which is worthy of praise.

Senators who wish personally to greet the Prime Minister, and perhaps put questions to him privately, may do so at this time.

The Prime Minister of Australia advanced to the area in front of the Vice President's desk, accompanied by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND, and was greeted by Members of the Senate as they were introduced to him.

The Prime Minister of Australia and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were then escorted from the Chamber.

At 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, in executive session, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BIBLE in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the 2 Houses

thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 942) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold," and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOMINATION OF JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN

The Senate in executive session resumed the consideration of the nomination of John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I was discussing Judge Harlan's refusal to answer certain questions. I continue to read from the record the judge's reply:

> That is the oath I have taken as a lawyer. It is the oath that I took when I became a member of the court of appeals. It is the oath that I will take if my nomination to the Supreme Court is confirmed.
>
> And you must judge me from what you have heard about me, and the impression that I make on you, and from what you can get from my history and record, as to whether that oath is a serious oath or whether I am simply talking for the record.

I believe that Judge Harlan would take his oath very seriously. However, I still say that the test is, What do men in their hearts believe? What do nominees in their hearts believe? Which road does their mind dictate this country shall follow? In Judge Harlan's case it is reinforced by his associations and by the fact that he is supported by Dewey and Dewey's henchmen.

I quote further from the record:

> Senator EASTLAND. I know you are not, sir. I have great admiration for you, sir.
>
> You were not asked about an organization that would believe in that. Of course, if the Court holds that a treaty, by an act of ratification of a treaty, these rights vest, it would be constitutional, it would be perfectly legal. And that is the gravest question that confronts this country.
>
> I am going to ask you another question. I want to know if you would make the same answer, that is, that by a treaty could we deprive the American people of rights guaranteed to them in the Bill of Rights, as the Secretary of State says? Can we deprive citizens of rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution?
>
> Senator MCCLELLAN. You mean by treaty?
>
> Senator EASTLAND. That is right.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN. By treaty.
>
> Senator EASTLAND. The Secretary of State says we can.
>
> Judge HARLAN. My recollection, if it serves me correctly—I am talking now from general newspaper reading—Mr. Dulles later qualified his statement in some fashion or other.

Mr. President, that is beside the point, and it was an evasion to say that Mr. Dulles had qualified his statement. The question was, What did the nominee believe? That is the question he refused to answer. It is beside the point, but I deny that Secretary Dulles ever qualified his statement. He merely said it was more or less hypothetical since a sound Republican administration had taken over.

Now, I find that the Secretary of State has gone even further than Secretary Acheson would have dreamed of going.

I continue to quote from Judge Harlan's answer:

> All I can say again to that is that that issue is one that has been the subject of numerous series of litigations in the Supreme Court. It has not arisen for the last time. I must ask your respectful indulgence in according me what I consider to be a necessary concomitant of this high office that I should not be asked to forecast how I will decide cases when they arise before me.

I say again, if the United States Senate, in deciding whether to confirm a man for this high office, cannot inquire whether he is well grounded in the law and cannot inquire into the legal principles in which he believes, then the power of confirmation is worthless.

> Senator EASTLAND. Would the same answer go to the question that a treaty can supplant the domestic laws of the State? Frankly, that was an issue raised in the Supreme Court of the United States and the Court divided, 4 to 4, on it.
>
> Now, do you think it would be improper for you to answer that question?
>
> Judge HARLAN. I do, sir, because that is again relating to a case, as I understood it from the discussion yesterday, that has recently been decided in the Court and which came up again, as I understand it, for reargument. All I can say in amplification to that area of your question is that, as in other cases, both my personal predilections and by my sworn duty to uphold the Constitution of the United States, I would decide those issues in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and the law of the United States as God gives me light to see the right result.

Mr. President, here we arrive at the crux of the issue. The Constitution and law of the United States will be what Judge Harlan says the Constitution and law of the United States are if he is permitted to mount the bench on faith and trust. What is all this sacrosanctity and hesitation about expressing opinions as to the meaning and intent of our fundamental law and the political and legal philosophies to which one adheres? Other judges of equal and superior eminence to Judge Harlan do not hesitate to let their convictions be known in no uncertain terms.

I submit it is certainly proper to make this inquiry of a man nominated for the Supreme Court. Some judges have expressed themselves most forcefully before the same committee, or subcommittee to the committee that heard Judge Harlan's testimony. Listen to the words of Chief Judge Orie L. Phillips, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the 10th circuit. No one can have any doubt where this great jurist stands—and the words were uttered in the forum and not on the bench:

> First, our Federal Government is and should continue to be one of delegated and limited powers. Its powers should be limited to matters that are national in scope and character, and matters which are essentially local in character should be reserved to the States and the people, with the power to deal with them in the light of peculiar local conditions and problems which differ widely throughout the various sections of our vast country;
>
> Second, it should not be possible through the exercise of the treatymaking power or by the exercise of legislative power derived from treaties to deprive an American citizen of any of his fundamental rights and freedoms.

Mr. President, there was a great judge, who did not hesitate to answer the question of how he stood on this grave question which confronts this country.

It may be that such statements as these would automatically disqualify Judge Phillips from nomination or confirmation to the Supreme Court, but I can think of no vote that would be more satisfying than to say "Yea" to his nomination.

Judge Florence Allen, of the Sixth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, has written a book on the subject The Treaty as an Instrument of Legislation. Judge Allen was not one who would run, hide, dodge, and refuse to answer questions.

Judge John J. Parker, of the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, has expressed his views in no uncertain terms, although, I, for one, am not in agreement with him.

Judge Harlan says "You must judge me from what you have heard about me, and the impression I make on you, and from what you can get from my history and record." Mr. President, he is simply asking us to play a game of blindman's buff. He says "You must trust me." His record has been searched with a fine tooth comb and in no particular can evidence be found regarding any expression of opinion or conviction concerning political or legal philosophy to-

ward the subject of treaty law. All that we can get from his history and record, from the time he went to England as a Rhodes scholar to date, stamps and characterizes him as an internationalist, either wittingly or unwittingly. The Supreme Court sits in precarious balance. Would Senators risk tipping the scales against sovereignty on the basis of speculation?

Mr. President, one of the most amazing facts in the history of our jurisprudence is that a treaty has never been declared unconstitutional. Time and time again, the Supreme Court has struck down and nullified acts of Congress and the constitutions and laws of the several States, as being contrary to the Constitution; but never a treaty or any of the provisions of one. This was understandable in our earlier history. But with the present multiplicity of treaties and executive agreements, it is not understandable today. Twice in the past 30 days this issue has been put to the Court—once in the Capps case, involving an executive agreement with Canada, and again in the Keefe case, where attack was made on the Status of the Forces Treaty with the NATO—but the Court always finds some other grounds for its decision and studiously avoids making any comment on the treaty aspect of the cases. This nominee will be the balance on the Court.

Then, finally, we have the Iowa case which has brought us to the threshold of what could be the most revolutionary change in the structure of this Government since it was founded. Thoughtful men, in every walk and talk of life, are justified in asking the question: Have we approached or passed the point of no return?

The Declaration of Independence has well been described as the spirit and the Constitution as the body of the political structure of this country. The enduring value of this system lies in the fact that it is the embodiment of political faith, founded on the religious faith, of the American people. The antithesis that now confronts the world is Christ versus the antichrist. For a court to attempt to graft the United Nations Charter into the body politic of this country is no more, nor no less, than an attempt to introduce the antichrist. Need I say more as to the gravity of the issue which now confronts us?

Mr. President, in this crisis, I, for one must be convinced beyond all reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty as to the political and legal philosophy of candidates suggested for the Supreme Court bench. The present nominee, John Marshall Harlan, refused to answer the critical question. The answer could not be found in his history and record. Therefore, I shall vote to reject his nomination.

Mr. President, in the beginning I said there have been entirely too many Cabinet members and Supreme Court Justices from the State of New York and from certain other States of the Union, that entirely too many States have been neglected, and that for that additional reason I would vote against confirmation in this case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD a list of Cabinet appointments and Supreme Court appointees from each State, from 1789 to 1900, and from 1900 to 1955.

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

State	Cabinet appointments [1]			Supreme Court appointments [2]		
	1789 to 1900	1900 to 1955	Total	1789 to 1900	1900 to 1955	Total
Alabama	1	0	1	2	1	3
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	1	0	1	0	0	0
California	1	6	7	2	1	3
Colorado	1	4	5	0	0	0
Connecticut	8	2	10	1	1	2
Delaware	5	0	5	0	0	0
District of Columbia	2	0	2	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia	9	0	9	2	1	3
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	7	10	17	2	0	2
Indiana	10	3	13	0	1	1
Iowa	6	5	11	1	1	2
Kansas	0	2	2	1	0	1
Kentucky	14	1	15	3	2	5
Louisiana	3	0	3	1	0	1
Maine	6	0	6	1	0	1
Maryland	13	2	15	4	0	4
Massachusetts	23	10	33	4	4	8
Michigan	5	6	11	1	1	2
Minnesota	3	2	5	0	1	1
Mississippi	4	0	4	1	0	1
Missouri	6	9	15	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	1	1	2	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	3	0	3	1	0	1
New Jersey	5	3	8	2	1	3
New Mexico	0	2	2	0	0	0
New York	29	30	59	7	6	13
North Carolina	4	2	6	2	0	2
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	19	7	26	5	4	9
Oklahoma	0	1	1	0	0	0
Oregon	1	1	2	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	30	10	40	5	1	6
Rhode Island	0	1	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	5	2	7	2	1	3
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	8	4	12	2	3	5
Texas	0	5	5	0	1	1
Utah	0	2	2	0	1	1
Vermont	2	1	3	0	0	0
Virginia	20	6	26	5	0	5
Washington	0	2	2	0	0	0
West Virginia	3	2	5	0	0	0
Wisconsin	5	2	7	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	1	1
United States	263	146	409	57	33	90

[1] Individual Cabinet members having continuous service in the same post under more than 1 administration have been counted once; only those members being reappointed after a lapse in service or named to a different Cabinet post have been counted more than once.

[2] The Supreme Court tabulation includes the nomination of Judge Harlan. It excludes appointments of Associate Justices to Chief Justice from bench membership. Justice Hughes' 2 appointments are counted because of the break in service.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD an analysis of Cabinet and Supreme Court appointments.

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

ANALYSIS OF CABINET AND SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS

The following analysis is based on the attached chart. On the chart, individual Cabinet Members having continuous service in the same post under more than one administration have been counted once; only those Members being reappointed after a lapse in service or named to a different Cabinet post have been counted more than once.

The Supreme Court tabulation included the nomination of Judge Harlan. It excludes appointments of Associate Justices to Chief Justice from bench membership. Justice Hughes' two appointments are counted because of the break in service.

Seven States have never been represented in either the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court. They are:

Arizona	749, 587
Florida	2, 771, 305
Idaho	588, 637
Montana	591, 024
Nevada	160, 083
North Dakota	619, 636
South Dakota	652, 740
Total population	6, 133, 012

Twenty States have never had representation on the Supreme Court. These States are:

Arizona	749, 587
Arkansas	1, 909, 511
Colorado	1, 325, 089
Delaware	318, 085
Florida	2, 771, 305
Idaho	588, 637
Missouri	3, 954, 653
Montana	591, 024
Nebraska	1, 325, 510
Nevada	160, 083
New Mexico	681, 187
North Dakota	619, 636
Oklahoma	2, 233, 351
Oregon	1, 521, 341
Rhode Island	791, 896
South Dakota	652, 740
Vermont	377, 747
Washington	2, 378, 963
West Virginia	2, 005, 552
Wisconsin	3, 434, 575
Total population	28, 390, 372

Delaware, Rhode Island, and Vermont were among the original Thirteen Colonies. Missouri was admitted to the Union in 1821; Arkansas in 1836; Florida in 1845; Wisconsin in 1848; and Oregon in 1859.

Twenty-nine States have had no Supreme Court appointments since 1900.

The 20 States listed immediately above, plus:

Illinois	8, 712, 176
Kansas	1, 905, 299
Louisiana	2, 683, 516
Maine	913, 744
Maryland	2, 343, 001
Mississippi	2, 178, 914
New Hampshire	533, 242
North Carolina	4, 061, 929
Virginia	3, 318, 680
Total population	26, 650, 501
Plus 20 above	28, 390, 372
Total population	55, 040, 875

Thirteen States have had no representation in the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court from 1900 to date. They are:

Arizona	749, 587
Arkansas	1, 909, 511
Delaware	318, 085
Florida	2, 771, 305
Idaho	588, 637
Maine	913, 774
Mississippi	2, 178, 914
Louisiana	2, 683, 513
Montana	591, 024
Nevada	160, 083
New Hampshire	533, 242
North Dakota	619, 636
South Dakota	652, 740
Total population	14, 670, 051

Eight States have never had a representative in the Cabinet:

Arizona	749, 587
Florida	2, 771, 305
Idaho	588, 637
Montana	591, 024
Nevada	160, 083

North Dakota	619,636
South Dakota	652,740
Wyoming	290,529
Total population	6,423,541

Sixteen States have had no representation in the Cabinet from 1900 to date:

The 8 listed immediately above, plus—

Alabama	3,061,743
Arkansas	1,909,511
Delaware	318,085
Georgia	3,444,578
Louisiana	2,683,516
Maine	913,744
Mississippi	2,178,914
New Hampshire	533,242
Total population	15,143,333
Plus 8 above	6,423,541
Total population	21,466,874

States with the greatest number of appointees are:

	Supreme Court	Cabinet	Total
New York	13	59	72
Pennsylvania	6	40	46
Massachusetts	8	33	41
Ohio	9	26	35
Virginia	5	26	31
Kentucky	5	15	20
Maryland	4	15	19
Illinois	2	17	19
Tennessee	5	12	17
Indiana	1	13	14
Iowa	2	11	13
Missouri	0	15	15
Connecticut	2	10	12
Michigan	2	11	13
New Jersey	3	8	11
California	3	7	10
South Carolina	3	7	10

The appointments from these 17 States represents more than 80 percent of the total.

The first seven States account for more than 50 percent of the positions.

The State of New York has dominated every Cabinet position with the exceptions of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare. The breakdown shows:

Secretaries of State	10
Secretaries of Treasury	11
Secretaries of War	10
Secretaries of Navy	5
Attorneys General	7
Secretary of Interior	1
Postmasters General	6
Secretaries of Commerce and Labor	2
Secretaries of Commerce	2
Secretary of Labor	1
Secretaries of Defense	2
Total	59

Twenty-nine of these appointments were made prior to 1900 and 30 subsequent thereto. Of the total of 13 Supreme Court appointments, 7 were before and 6 after 1900, excluding Justice Stone's appointment from associate to chief justice.

New York's overall ratio of appointments to population equals 1 for every 205,973 of its citizens. At the other extreme this compares with 0 against 6,133,012 citizens in the seven States that have never been represented in the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court.

Percentagewise New York has received in excess of 14 percent of the total Cabinet and Supreme Court appointments; in excess of 12 percent of all Cabinet appointments; and 19 percent of the Supreme Court appointments since 1900; 20 percent of all Cabinet appointments since 1900.

The Eastern States of New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania combined have received the total of 159 Cabinet and Supreme Court appointments. This represents more than 30 percent of the total.

The same three States have been given a total of 28 appointments to the Supreme Court, more than 30 percent of all made. Since 1900, they have received 11 appointments, more than 33 percent of the total. Twenty States, previously listed, with a combined population of 28,390,372 have never received a single appointment to the Supreme Court.

Six States, New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Maryland, account for 5 Supreme Court appointments, 50 percent of all made. The Supreme Court representation by States is:

New York	13
Massachusetts	8
Ohio	9
Pennsylvania	6
Kentucky	5
Maryland	4
Tennessee	5
Virginia	5
South Carolina	3
Alabama	3
California	3
Connecticut	2
Georgia	3
New Jersey	3
Illinois	2
Iowa	2
Louisiana	1
Michigan	2
North Carolina	2
Indiana	1
Kansas	1
Maine	1
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	1
New Hampshire	1
Texas	1
Utah	1
Wyoming	1

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that to my mind there is no doubt that Judge Harlan is a very fine lawyer, and there is no doubt that he is a man of unimpeachable integrity, and, in my opinion, he is a very high class gentleman. I do not agree with his political philosophy. I think he has not met the test, namely, to state as a condition of confirmation how he stands on the questions which I have enumerated. Because he declined to do so I find it necessary to cast my vote against the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have more than a casual interest in the nomination which is before the Senate today. The nominee was born in Chicago. As I recall, his father was a candidate for the mayoralty in Chicago a great many years ago. I have received a large volume of mail, telephone calls, telegrams, and other communications with respect to the nominee. Some of the communications have scolded me rather soundly because when his nomination came before the Judiciary Committee I supported it. I am delighted to see such a manifestation of interest in a nomination for the highest tribunal of this country. It connotes some interest on the part of the people in those who shall grace the Supreme Court bench, and, quite aside from the general tenor of the communications which have come to my attention, I am still delighted to observe the interest. It was not quite borne out, of course, by the number of witnesses who appeared before the committee. I thought there would have been a larger number. I thought the testimony with respect to Judge Harlan, and particularly that of adverse witnesses, would have been a little more substantial than it was. It is not necessary for me to recite or to review all the testimony which was presented to the committee.

First, Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], with respect to the integrity and the character of the nominee. It was not impeached by any witness. It was not impeached in any letter or communication which has come to my attention.

I believe it can be said that he possesses judicial temperament. He has graced the Federal circuit bench for more than a year; and for that position his nomination was confirmed by the Senate in February 1954.

His sense of civic responsibility is beyond impeachment. He gave 8 months without compensation as general counsel to the New York Crime Commission. That commission did a noteworthy and outstanding job in the State of New York. For his unselfishness and his sense of civic duty, I think he deserves the plaudits of and a salute from his fellow countrymen.

So we start with an area of agreement, namely, that nothing was said in derogation of his character, his integrity, his sense of civic duty, and, I think, his judicial temperament.

It was agreed by all who know him and by all who are familiar with the record that he is one of the Nation's outstanding lawyers. To be sure, he is a specialist in the field of monopoly law. As the Senator from Mississippi so well said, Judge Harlan was counsel on the other side in the celebrated Du Pont case.

It would be difficult for me to understand how a man of his brilliant attainments in the legal field, a man of his vigor, could be wanting in judicial temperament and in judicial capacity. I think we can take that for granted from the record.

The point of controversey arises from Judge Harlan's identity with an organization known as Atlantic Union. He was a member of the advisory committee, and he came within the orbit of that advisory committee pretty much as Members of the Senate find themselves suddenly gracing boards of directors or designated as trustees of national organizations.

About 2 years ago I discovered my name on a letterhead, and I had to threaten mandamus proceedings in the Federal district court for the District of Columbia to have my name removed. I was not certain at the time as to exactly what the purposes of the organization were. However, I learned that it was doing things that I could not support and which were not consonant with my own views.

I have had that experience many times; and I should say that, on the average, at least one request comes to my desk every week, sometimes two requests, to join a national organization having idealistic purposes and objectives. Later I discover that, in actual practice, programs and policies are pur-

sued which seem to be at variance with what was announced in idealistic language. The result is that one finds himself in some difficulty.

I think that was the case with Judge Harlan and the Atlantic Union. He received a letter from one who once graced the Supreme Court, former Justice Owen Roberts. The letter is contained in the hearings.

I fancy that if I had received that letter and knew nothing more about the organization, I might very well, in a moment of weakness, have slipped a joint and have become a member of the advisory committee. I may say that the advisory committee numbers among its personnel ambassadors, generals, admirals, and business heads of all kinds throughout the country. In all, it is a rather imposing list. A partial list, at least, appears in the hearings; and anyone who wishes to take the trouble to examine the membership of the advisory committee of the Atlantic Union, will find it there.

I think it should be said, too, that when the exploratory resolution on Atlantic Union was introduced in 1951, 28 Members of the United States Senate and 10 Members of the House of Representatives were sponsors. There will be found in the hearings, also, a list of 100 Members of the House of Representatives who evidently formally gave assurances that they intended to support the exploratory resolution on Atlantic Union.

So it is not so difficult to understand how a practicing attorney should receive from a former Justice of the Supreme Court a letter setting forth that the organization was devoted to mutual security purposes, and should then suddenly say, "I shall be delighted to join."

Judge Harlan even testified that at some meeting after that, he probably made a contribution of $25. But the rest of the testimony is that he attended no meetings, he performed no functions, and he did not know what Atlantic Union actually was about; and he said as much. When the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] was quizzing him, Judge Harlan made an answer which will be found on page 172 of the hearings. The Senator from Indiana had read some Atlantic Union literature pertaining to the specific purposes of the organization, and Judge Harlan responded as follows:

> This is the first time, unless it was read yesterday, that I have ever heard that statement read. If Justice Roberts is correctly quoted, and the implication that you draw from what is said there is correct, I disassociate myself from it, because I don't believe in it.

Judge Harlan knew nothing about Atlantic Union except what was in the letter from Justice Roberts. So it is easily understandable as to how and why he and other persons become affiliated with such organizations.

With respect to his fidelity to the constitutional concept, I can do no better than to repeat what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said, because the testimony is in the hearings. This is Judge Harlan responding to a question asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. He said:

> And all I can say by way of amplification, with what I have said as to my own attitude on these questions, that I am not one of those who believes in any organization, the purpose of which is to override the Constitution of the United States, to surrender one iota of its sovereignty, and that the relationships that we must necessarily have in this complicated world and dangerous situation, are relationships which must be achieved and which can be achieved and were intended to be achieved within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

When a moot question or a speculative question is asked of a nominee, I am not so sure what my own response would be if I were in his position. The distinguished former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary said a moment ago that I was something of an enigma. He expected me to vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan.

I said, "Senator, I try to do two things: First, I put myself in the witness chair to see what my own responses would be. Second, I project myself into one of those robes on the high court to see what my attitude would be there."

So I believe that confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan on the basis of all that has been presented thus far is warranted.

Mr. President, I know the source of the fears that go with this matter. I have received my share of telegrams and letters. The fact of the matter is that the fear today springs from the danger of interpretation of what is in the Constitution of the United States, and the actions by Congress, including the Senate. Today the issue, in my judgment, is not John Marshall Harlan; I think the issue is the failure of the United States Senate to take action on a provision in the Constitution which permits a loophole, in the light of our commitments to worldwide organizations.

Article VI of the Constitution contains certain provisions. Too often we do not read the entire article, so it is well to refresh ourselves. This is what article VI provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land—

And then, Mr. President, the Constitution says—

> and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

That is the Constitution. It is supreme. The laws made in pursuance of it are supreme. The treaties are supreme. That is what the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution.

So the question then arises, in connection with the nominee, How is he going to interpret that language when some specific commitment involving countries abroad comes to the Court's attention? The first thing, of course, that is recited, as it was in the Iowa case, is the United Nations Charter. We fail to go back to primary sources, for this is the book, this is the gospel, this is the test, because this is the official charter of the United Nations, together with the statute of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. President, Judge Harlan had nothing to do with the writing of this charter. This charter was ratified by the Senate of the United States. It was ratified on July 28, 1945. It was ratified by a vote of 89 to 2. I think my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was 1 of the 2 Senators who voted against it.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, and I am proud of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not in my mind who the other Senator was.

Mr. LANGER. Senator Shipstead of Minnesota.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have stated what the vote was. The reason why this charter is in being today, so far as the United States is concerned, is that 89 Senators of this body, before I became a Member of the Senate, although I was then a Member of the House, which had nothing to do with treaties in those days, said that the charter was satisfactory, and they ratified it.

Let me refer to a provision or two of the United Nations Charter:

> Ch. IX. International Economic and Social Cooperation. Article 55. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being, which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of people, the United Nations shall promote:
>
> (a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions for economic and social progress and development.

Did Judge Harlan write that, Mr. President? He did not. The charter was contrived in San Francisco, but 89 Senators said it was satisfactory, and so it became a treaty, and the Constitution provides that a treaty shall be the supreme law of the land.

Judge Harlan did not fasten the United Nations Charter on the country. The Senate of the United States did it, because it could not have become effective without the sanction, consent, and advice of the Senate of the United States.

The article continues:

> (b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems and international cultural and educational cooperation.

It continues, Mr. President:

> (c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Now, give ear, Mr. President, to article 56, because that contains the "clout," as is said. That is a rather colloquial term, but everybody knows what it means. Article 56 reads as follows:

> All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55.

The Senate of the United States knew that language was in the charter, and the Senate pledged this country to it, under its constitutional authority to give

advice on and consent to treaties. Senators must have read the language. Judge Harlan had nothing to do with it. The language was approved by the Senate of the United States. If his nomination is confirmed, Judge Harlan will sit on a tribunal where he will be expected to interpret, not what he wrote, but what the Senate approved; and the Senate approved the United Nations Charter with its eyes open—I hope.

Then, Mr. President, let us look at article 59, which reads as follows:

> The organization shall—

It does not say "may." The article says:

> The organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the states concerned for the creation of any new specialized agency required for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in article 55.

Did Judge Harlan write that? He had nothing to do with it. He probably did not even know the proposal was before the Senate. The Constitution of the United States provides that the treaty, called the United Nations Charter, is the supreme law of the land, along with the laws passed by Congress, and the Constitution.

So if the nomination of Judge Harlan shall be confirmed, he will take an oath to do what? Let me read the oath he will take, or, at least, which I hope he will have a chance to take. Let me read it into the RECORD. Every justice or judge of the United States shall take the following oath or affirmation before performing the duties of his office:

> I, ——— ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as ——— according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and the laws of the United States: So help me God.

That is what he will have to say. He will hold up his hand and say, "Agreeably to the Constitution and the laws of the United States."

What is the law, Mr. President? I have been reading from the Charter of the United Nations. Judge Harlan had nothing to do with its framing. All he will do will be to interpret it when it gets to him.

The fear, of course, is understandable. I refer in that connection to the Rice case, which was resolved in the Supreme Court of Iowa in the October term of 1953. Sergeant Rice died or was killed in Korea. His wife was a Caucasian. She contracted with the Sioux City Cemetery Association for a lot. In the contract, of course, she had to agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the cemetery. One of the regulations was that only Caucasians could be buried in that cemetery. The managers and trustees of the cemetery association did not know anything about Sergeant Rice until the day of the funeral. Then they discovered that Indian mourners appeared. That was the first time they knew Seregant Rice was part Indian. They discovered Sergeant Rice was eleven-sixteenths Indian. As I have said there was a provision in the contract for the cemetery lot which stated that no one could be interred in the cemetery unless he was a Caucasian.

Sergeant Rice's wife sued for breach of contract, and the case went to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa. Many things were averred by attorneys for the plaintiff and attorneys for the defendant, but the interesting fact was that they went back to article 55 in the United Nations Charter. It was contended that an organization cannot discriminate in that manner, and the United Nations Charter was pointed to as being the law of the land. As a result of what the United States Senate did on the 28th of July, 1945, the charter was made a treaty law, and was invoked by lawyers.

Judge Harlan did not have anything to do with that. If he sits on the Supreme Court bench he will interpret questions that come to him for interpretation.

I ask my colleagues not to be "kidded." Lawyers all over the country, when they examine their cases, are going to invoke the provision of the United Nations Charter to which I have referred. If I were in active practice back in my home State and certain cases came before me, one of the first things I would do would be to burn the midnight oil and ascertain if I could not find in the United Nations Charter something which was germane to my side of the case, and if I thought it was germane I would plead it in the lower courts, and I would plead it in the Supreme Court of the United States. After all, it is the duty of an advocate to do the best he can in the interest of his client.

One of the judges who decided the Rice case was an old classmate of mine in the study of law back in my days in Minnesota. I hope some time to have a chance to talk to him about the question. What happened? There was a split opinion. The Court could not agree. It divided 4 to 4. It would have been rather interesting to hear the arguments as to article 55 from the cloisters of the Court.

But when it comes to the question of what Judge Harlan did, he knew nothing about it. Eighty-nine Members of the Senate put this country into the United Nations, and article 55 is in its charter. When we read it, and then when we refer to article VI of the Constitution, which provides that—

> All treaties made * * * under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land.

We find that article 55 is the supreme law. Any lawyer will plead it, and there are going to be more and more lawyers who will raise this question. That is why it is so important.

I must add one thing. I get quite a little stimulation in going back and looking at a tremendous report which was made in 1952 by the President's Materials Policy Commission, composed of William S. Paley, president of the Columbia Broadcasting Corp., as chairman, and George R. Brown, Arthur H. Bunker, Eric Hodgins, and Edward S. Mason. They submitted the report, which is in 4 volumes, and comprises in excess of 1,000 pages. It is rather well done, too, Mr. President.

In the first volume, the Commission refers to the Habana Charter for International Trade Organizations and the various agreements we have entered into, such as the International Sugar Agreement, the International Wheat Agreement, and the many others. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] will remember the testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, either during or after the war, I have forgotten which—but after the war, I think—by the International Materials Conference, which was an informal organization in the State Department.

This is what the President's Materials Policy Commission said:

> The United States has not ratified the treaty but under a resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a general guide.

I read further:

> The further steps which in the Commission's view the United States should take on chapter VI of the Habana Charter are discussed later in relation to the Commission's conclusions about the types of agreements which may help to stabilize materials markets, agreements upon which chapter VI would have a definite bearing.

We are moving deeper and deeper into the orbit. There was an agreement on tin. Efforts were made to reach agreements regarding various critical materials; and some of the eager beavers were only too anxious to bring us into the orbit. Why? Well, here is the law; I read article 55. It is broad enough for anything. But John Harlan had nothing to do with it. The United States Senate approved that language; and there we are today.

So we get around to what? We get around to the real issue before the Senate this afternoon. What is it? It is not the nomination of John Marshall Harlan. The issue is the failure of the Senate of the United States to meet the challenge as the result of our excursions into these world organizations and the power of treaties. We speak of treaty power, but I am more interested in the power of treaties, and there is an excellent example. There is the United Nations Treaty, which echoes in a cemetery case in Sioux City, Iowa, and finally comes to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, what is the function of Judge Harlan or any other judge? Only to interpret what the Congress has approved, only to interpret what, in conjunction with another body and the signature of the President, we place upon the statute books of the country. That will be his only function.

What would you say, Mr. President, if you read that language? I am not so sure what I might say in keeping with the oath I would take—"agreeably," as it says, "to the Constitution and the laws of the United States, so help me God." I can read the English language, and I can read the Constitution. I know it means different things to different people. But who, then, is the culprit—if that is not too inelegant a term? The

culprit is the Congress of the United States. Who is going to undo this? The Senate and the House. How are they going to undo it? Only by resuming their interest in the proposal which was made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], for which he was a one-man crusader into every section of the land.

That proposal should be brought before the Senate right away. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who now occupies the chair, and who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional amendment, that I trust that at a very early date we can set a hearing on the Bricker resolution, call witnesses to testify, and then bring this all-important issue back to the only body which can do anything about it, and the only body which can close a loophole which was left as a result of the commitments and the delegations of power which have been made, under a treaty, to international organizations. John Marshall Harlan cannot do it. That is a job for the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This question will continue to recur. Every time there is a nominee for the Supreme Court, the question will be, "What are his political beliefs? What are his ideological beliefs? How will he rule on this or that?"

I am not so sure that it was proper for Judge Harlan to respond to some of those questions. It was perfectly proper for a member of the Judiciary Committee to ask the questions; but the nominee had to remember that today he is on the Federal bench, a judge of the second circuit. So, in making his responses, he had to bear that in mind.

I think I would have been very cautious if I had been in a similar position, and had appeared before a senatorial committee, and if such a question had been asked of me. I would have been thinking whether a case involving that point might come before the court for resolution, and whether perhaps I would tie my own hands, and whether perhaps I would be foreclosing my own thinking on it, and would be tying myself to a commitment I could not keep, upon more meticulous examination of the language which probably would be presented.

So, Mr. President, I wind up pretty well where I began. The issue is not John Marshall Harlan, brilliant lawyer, concededly brilliant; a man of integrity of character; a man who has done yeoman public service, and has done his full share of civic jobs and duties. No one has attacked him on that score. The attack came only because of his rather formal but almost casual identity with the Atlantic Union, about which he knew nothing. By his own confession, in the record, he did not know it called for common citizenship; he did not know it called for common currency; he did not know it called for a common authority to enforce peace. And in response to a question from the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], Judge Harlan said, "If that is the case and if that is true, I disassociate myself from it."

In this rather complicated and accelerated age that is the easy way out when one gets into difficulties by allowing his name to be used by an organization when he does not know fully what its objectives, programs, and purposes are. That he might have been misled is not strange, when 28 Senators and 10 Members of the House were cosponsors of the resolution in 1951, and another 100 Members of Congress indicated that they would support the resolution. It is not strange that a candidate for a place on the highest tribunal on the basis of a letter which he received from a former Justice of the Supreme Court, should send him a one-paragraph note and say, "I will join," and even make a $25 contribution. I think that aspect of the matter has been too thoroughly amplified, beyond its true context.

But as we go back and examine the record, we find Judge Harlan speaking, on page 173:

> My views are that the Constitution is the thing that governs us all, whether in one branch of the Government or another, and if the Constitution, through the wisdom of Congress or the caption of the people is amended in any particular respect, that becomes the Constitution, and so far as I personally am concerned, it is the Constitution that I am sworn to uphold, and that will be my endeavor, to do it to the best of my ability.

I do not know what more, by way of a commitment, we could ask from a man of unimpeachable integrity and conceded capacity and competence in the legal field. So we get back to the issue—not the interpretation, but the language which made it possible for the Court to work its will upon, and possibly contravene, the domestic law and the rights of our people. Never was it so imperative that the Senate Judiciary Committee roll into action at once on the Bricker resolution; and the sooner it is done the better, because this will be a constantly recurring question.

It is for the reasons stated that I shall support the nomination of Judge Harlan.

Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire the floor briefly to speak on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to ask the Senator from Illinois a question, without the Senator from Kentucky losing the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The discussion this afternoon has involved the state of mind of the nominee on basic issues. In arriving at a conclusion as to whether or not the nominee deserves the approval of the Senate, should we not also consider the fine historical background of the nominee himself—his grandfather, his great grandfather, his early days in Indiana and his days in Kentucky?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a great tradition behind the family. That is the best one can say. They have been great citizens. They have carried on in the finest American tradition. I know of nothing more that one could ask, in that field, at least.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The nominee might at a given moment entertain an idea which any Senator might entertain. Are we to say that we are the only ones who believe in the Constitution and Declaration of Independence? We take our oath of office to do our duty. If an American citizen, no matter how humble, holds to a certain belief, should we, merely for that reason, deny him the confirmation of his nomination to an office to which the President of the United States has appointed him?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the Judiciary Committee was entirely within its rights in pursuing one line of questioning or another. It is always for the nominee, with a proper concept of propriety, to determine whether or not he should answer the questions. That is a matter which only he could determine under the circumstances. So I do not quarrel for a moment with the questions which were asked. I say only that we ought to get the issue into its proper focus, because it will arise over and over and over again, every time the United Nations Charter is invoked in some domestic action at law or in equity. So let us go back to the basic issue. Let us go back to the document which was ratified by this body, and which, under the Constitution, is made the supreme law of the land. That is where we must go.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with everything the Senator from Illinois has had to say. I sincerely and conscientiously believe that the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence are supreme over anything, regardless of what others might think, either correctly or incorrectly. Merely because Congress takes a certain action, I cannot for a moment see why a citizen of this country should not be free to entertain the idea that Congress might have been mistaken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my friend from New Mexico that that is really not the issue. The issue I have been belaboring is simply this: When we effectuate a treaty, under our constitutional processes we give it the dignity of supreme law. Then the question arises: Is there language which, by reasonable interpretation, can supervene and contravene the rights of the people in a case under domestic law? The first paragraph of the Bricker resolution provides that a treaty shall not have the effect of internal law unless it is implemented, or unless it is consonant with the Constitution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I voted for the Bricker resolution when it came before the Senate at the last session and if I have the opportunity it is my purpose to vote for it again. But until the Bricker resolution becomes the law of the land, or a part of the law of the land, there is no particular reason why, under our form of government, we should not pass judgment on a man whom I consider a pretty good citizen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that as a result of the discussion finally there will come an awakened interest in the substance of the Bricker resolution. I fancy that in due course the country will respond, because the people will see what the real issue is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my observations regarding this nomination.

I do not know Judge Harlan personally. So far as I now know, I never met him. I casually knew his father, who lived in Kentucky many years ago and moved to Illinois. That is the only thing I could hold against him.

As a boy in Kentucky, I was a great admirer of the nominee's grandfather, John Marshall Harlan, whose very name carries us back almost to the origins of our country, in the traditions of the American bar.

The original Justice Harlan was born in my State, in the county of Boyle. He became a county judge of that county. For 4 years he was attorney general of the State of Kentucky. Twice, in 1871 and 1875, he was the Republican nominee for governor of the State from which I come. Of course, in the state of political affairs at that time that was a hopeless honor, because he could not be, and was not, elected. In November 1877, the month and year in which I was born, he was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

If I am not mistaken, he served longer than any other Justice of the Supreme Court in the history of the United States except John Marshall himself. Justice Harlan served as a Justice of the Supreme Court, as I recall, 34 years, and John Marshall, for whom Justice Harlan was named, served 35 years. He was not only one of the longest in service, but he was one of the most independent and outstanding Justices of the Supreme Court.

If the sins of the father are to be visited upon his sons to the third and fourth generation, surely the virtues of the father also should be visited upon his sons to the third and fourth generation.

I mention these circumstances merely to set forth the background of the nominee to the highest court in our land. I may be partially actuated by sentiments revolving around my own State. I may be partially actuated by the great admiration I had as a youth for Justice Harlan.

However, in view of that, and in view of an utter lack of any implications which would disqualify the grandson of Justice Harlan to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, I feel it my duty not only to vote for the confirmation of his nomination but to speak these brief words in support of confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. President, every time we vote to confirm the nomination not only of a member of the Supreme Court but of any other member of the judicial system, we take a chance. We take a chance on how a man's mind will work when he dons the robes of a Justice of the Supreme Court. We assume a risk. We cannot always know in advance everything—and probably we should not press an inquiry along that line—concerning how any nominee for appointment to the Court will decide a given case. He cannot know all the ramifications of a case. He cannot know in advance what the evidence will be and what the circumstances will be. Therefore we must trust the members of the Court as we must trust ourselves, and as we must trust other nominees whose confirmation we are called upon to consider.

I have only a meager knowledge of the personality of the nominee in this case. However, I understand that he had an honorable career at the bar. Like all lawyers, including some of us, he took cases as they came to him. There is no evidence that he ever went forth chasing cases. He was not an ambulance chaser. He was a dignified lawyer. He hung out his shingle and awaited clients. Clients came to him. He was a successful lawyer at the New York bar. The fact that he was appointed a judge of the court of appeals only a year or so ago does not militate against him or his qualifications. If that were a disqualification, many of the present members of the Supreme Court would not have been qualified to be appointed or confirmed. Many of them did not serve on any court prior to their appointment to the Supreme Court.

I shall not now discuss the Bricker amendment, but I shall discuss it if it comes before the Senate. I was not in the Senate last year, when it was voted on. Probably I shall be here when and if it is voted on again. I do not wish to bring that subject into this discussion. I do not believe it is important so far as the nomination of Judge Harlan is concerned.

Neither do I regard as important the fact that Judge Harlan was a nominal member of the advisory board of an international organization. Many good men have been enticed into membership in organizations which seem to be working in behalf of good causes designed to benefit mankind.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has stated, many of us have been solicited from time to time to join such organizations. I had a similar experience several years ago. I joined the advisory board of an organization which seemed to be designed to benefit the American people. Later I found that it was giving out propaganda and statements and taking positions with which I did not agree. I immediately resigned. I never took any active part in it. However, that experience is likely to come to any man who has any public consciousness or who has any desire to allow his name or his influence to be used in behalf of some great cause that appeals to many people. I see nothing in that. I see no implication, so far as Judge Harlan's future attitude on public questions may be concerned, in his membership in such an organization.

I have many good friends who have been members of it. I have myself declined to be. That does not mean that I have lessened my respect for men who have seen fit to join such organizations in some capacity that appeals to them, in view of the world confusion and the world problems of today.

Mr. President, as a Kentuckian and as an admirer of the Harlan family, which until recently lived in the county of Boyle in the State of Kentucky, in which the grandfather of the nominee, the great Justice of the Supreme Court, was born and lived, I feel it my duty to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. Notwithstanding the fact that the Senator from Kentucky and I are of different national origins, I believe we have something very much in common. We are emotional. I believe that possibly I, more than anyone else in the Senate, have been the beneficiary of the best things that are American. It is in that vein that I wish to speak to my fellow Members of the Senate today.

I, too, know the background of the nominee. I do not know the nominee personally. However, I have not only a sense of appreciation of my fellowman, but I have also a sense of duty toward my fellowman.

It was not so long ago when Ohio and Indiana and even Kentucky were a part of the great West. If anyone went beyond the New York line or the Pennsylvania line, he was lost. So far as Ohio and Kentucky and Indiana and even Illinois are concerned, they were populated by people who moved there from other States.

When we think of the Harlans in Kentucky, we think of the people from other States that settled in Kentucky. When we think of the appointment of the nominee's grandfather, in 1877, of what does it remind us?

It does not remind us of the present President of the United States, or of the previous President of the United States. It reminds us of the ideals of Rutherford P. Hayes and of the people of those times, descendants of Anglo-Americans, who came to this country to carry out the ideals of free nations. It was from the descendants of Daniel Austin, of Vermont; Moses Austin, of Missouri; and Steven Austin, of Texas; and of the Austins that Rutherford B. Hayes came.

In my opinion, Tilden should have been elected. I happen to be on the other side of the fence politically, but I think Hayes made a great contribution by having in mind, at least, the fact that the Constitution had to be interpreted by Americans, irrespective of party politics, and he did select John M. Harlan, of Kentucky, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination, without knowing the nominee. But I have read the hearings, and I think he will make a great Justice of the Supreme Court. Many persons think a nominee for the Supreme Court must have had experience. The best judges I have ever known were lawyers whom the people elected at the grassroots. They would interpret the law in the first instance. An average person would not have an opportunity to be appointed to the Supreme Court. On that

Court we wish to have the best lawyers in the first instance. I believe this nominee, with his fine historical background, has an understanding of the philosophy of English common law and an understanding of the philosophy of a free government. I do not wish him to tell me how he should decide cases. If I should do so and he should follow my advice, I would not be in favor of the confirmation of his nomination. I wish him to decide cases as he sees them, as he understands the facts and the law.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the people of the United States are deeply concerned over the appointment of a new Justice to the Supreme Court of the United States. They are especially concerned because of attempts to limit the sovereignty of the American Government through the United Nations Charter, and proposals for an Atlantic Union.

From persons in my own State and in other States I have received many letters, asking me to weigh the new appointment in the light of the long debate over the Bricker amendment, showing the dangerous expansion of the executive power through treaty-made laws.

Our people have also been disturbed more than a little by the facts revealed in the Sioux City Cemetery case in which the Court was evenly divided on a question involving the effect of treaty law on a private cemetery in Iowa. The decision carried to a critical point the danger revealed in the steel seizure case, in which three members of the Supreme Court were of the opinion that the President of the United States had the power and the duty, under the obligations of treaty law, to seize property which he was forbidden by the American Constitution to touch.

I share the doubts and concern of my fellow citizens. I agree that the new appointment to the Court is of transcendent importance. I have decided, nevertheless, to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan. He is, I believe, fully qualified professionally for the position. He has stated that he will meet all issues with full obligation to his oath to support the Constitution.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] put his finger on the spot. The United Nations Treaty is as much a part of the Constitution as is the Bill of Rights. If the Congress, by its ratification of that treaty, has diluted the American system of government, then it does not matter whether we place Judge Harlan on the Supreme Court bench or whether we place there the most conservative man we can find in the Nation. He would still have to uphold the law and the Constitution; and the United Nations Treaty is the supreme law of the land.

So, Mr. President, the only way we are going to remove these doubts of the American people is by political action, namely, for Congress to pass the Bricker amendment and also to take back the power it has given away.

This leaves the crucial political issue before us, with all the threatened dangers. The sovereignty of the United States is being eroded, and the Constitution is being undermined. Sixty-one Members of the United States Senate have voted, in the George amendment, that our Constitution needs new bulwarks to protect it against the strong currents leading, by way of treaty law, to a supergovernment.

I take the position that the duty of protecting the Constitution rests on Congress. It cannot be shifted by Congress to any other branch of government.

If Congress has passed a law, or the Senate has approved a treaty, which leads to diminution of American sovereignty, the members of the judicial branch have no choice but to interpret the law or the treaty as Congress has approved it.

I cannot ask a nominee for Justice of the Supreme Court to interpret the law in any way except the way Congress has written it.

The Supreme Court has been meticulously careful to observe the line between political and judicial powers. It has fully upheld the right of Congress to pass any laws and make any political choices within the limits set in the Constitution.

Congress is the branch of Government responsible for deciding political issues. The Executive has no choice but to administer the law as written. The courts have no choice but to interpret the law as written.

All the political winds and currents bear on Congress. It resolves those pressures into a set of policies which will serve the interests of the Nation as a whole.

This high task of weighing the diversities of interest and inclination within the Nation and shaping them into a truly American policy embodied in law I would not surrender to any other branch of Government if I could.

If Congress is dissatisfied with the results of its legislative acts, the whole responsibility to undo the damage rests on Congress.

At this time I should like to point out, Mr. President, the specific remedies which lie within our power.

Congress has passed a number of laws since the end of World War II which dilute American sovereignty. These include adoption of the U. N. Charter, the NATO agreement, the Status of Forces Treaties, and provisions in the mutual-security bills which permit the President of the United States to assign members of the Armed Forces and of civilian Government agencies to foreign governments or international agencies.

On January 8, 1954, the late Senator Pat McCarran, former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, analyzing the legal implications of the U. N. Charter, stated on the Senate floor that:

> Today under the present state of the law, the Congress of the United States is no longer a legislature of delegated powers, to be exercised within prescribed limits, but a legislature of unlimited and undelegated power.

The checks and balances in the Constitution had already been removed by congressional approval of treaties which permitted or even compelled Congress, in honor, to pass laws contrary to the Constitution. The former chairman of the Judiciary Committee reminded us that any judge—and that includes Judge Harlan or any other person who might have been nominated—trying to decide on the constitutionality of a law today would have to hold the Constitution of the United States in one hand and the U. N. Charter in the other.

A few days later I myself stated that, under article 56 of the U. N. Charter, which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] just read to the Senate, the American Congress had pledged itself to "take joint and separate action," not in its own best judgment but "in cooperation with" the United Nations, that is, only in a form acceptable to the United Nations, to carry out the objectives of article 55, which pledged a world welfare state.

I say to the Senate that the question of saving our country and our liberties cannot be hung on some judge whose nomination is before the Senate for consideration. We must, by political action, withdraw the power we have passed on to others by the ratification of treaties which destroy the liberties of our country. That is where we find ourselves today, in the middle of the 20th century. The sooner we face up to this condition the sooner will the necessity of our meeting such problems day by day disappear. There is no sense in taking chances.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] quote from the speech of Secretary of State Dulles in Louisville, Ky. Then I heard the Senator from Mississippi quote Judge Harlan to the effect that Secretary Dulles had added to his statement since that time. Yes, I will tell Senators what the Secretary added to that speech.

He said, "What I said in Louisville, Ky., was right; but now that we have a Republican administration in office, trust us."

Mr. President, I trust no political party with the liberties and the future of my country. Why should we take a chance of any kind? Let us write safeguards into the law. Then when an official steps out of line he can be impeached.

"Trust us?" I am concerned about the danger to our national sovereignty which may come from future agreements drafted by the executive department or from future decisions by the Supreme Court.

The greater danger, however, is here now, and the duty of protecting our national sovereignty lies with us in Congress.

I shall not take the time of the Senate for any criticism of present or former Members of Congress. I know how these matters are conducted. The old propaganda machine is organized; and all the pinkos, eggheads, commentators, and columnists start grinding. Then up comes a United Nations treaty.

Mr. President, it was in August 1945 that the United Nations Charter was ratified by the Senate by a vote of 89 yeas; with only 2 Members voting against it.

We did not know that the Iowa Cemetery case was coming up; but it is here. That is what we are facing in the 20th century.

I do not wish to criticize past Congresses, because they are like some I have seen. Members do not even know what is contained in many treaties, and, naturally, they do not know what is contained in executive agreements. So we cannot be held accountable for them. There are thousands of them in existence today.

I have come to the conclusion that both Congress and the American people suffered a kind of shellshock during World War II, which was the effect of the monstrous misapplication of American energy we call unconditional surrender. We have hardly begun to estimate the errors, and confusions, and losses of those fateful years.

It is not our task to blame earlier Congresses for passing this legislation to reduce our sovereignty. But our people will blame the present Congress if it does not set to work at once to undo the damage.

I say the Bricker amendment, or the George amendment, or whatever it is desired to call it, should be brought before the Senate immediately. Then it will not be necessary to worry about the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan or of anyone else. Protection will have been written into the law. It will not be necessary to depend upon men. The safeguards will have become a part of the body of law of the United States, which is not a government of men.

The advocates of supra-national sovereignty plan to subordinate our national security to that of other nations, to change our basic law, dilute our population, divide our national resources, and blot out the American way of life.

The first safeguard needed to protect our Nation is passage of the Bricker amendment which, in the form of the George amendment, received 61 votes in the Senate only last year. I need add nothing to what has been said of the importance of its early passage by this Congress.

I am greatly concerned about the fact that this is the year for revision of the United Nations Charter. Do Senators know that Congress already has appropriated many thousands of dollars for the study of the revision of the United Nations Charter, which is to be considered this year, I believe in September?

Supporters of restricted sovereignty for the United States are aggressive, well-organized, and well supplied with funds. They are busy shaping public opinion in all parts of the United States. What are the guardians of American sovereignty doing? The answer is: Nothing. Shall we sit and wait until a completed program is presented to us, with a well-organized prapaganda support, and then wring our hands, and say, "It is too late. We can do nothing. I do not particularly like it, but I am going to go along"?

How many times have I heard that statement on the floor of the Senate?

I intend to submit a resolution, Mr. President. I hope it will not be buried and forgotten, because I think it will be vital to the questions we are discussing today. I shall ask that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to prepare a complete report on all the legislation, treaties, amendments of treaties, executive agreements, court decisions, and other acts of government which have effectively reduced American national sovereignty. The report should also point out what action by Congress would be needed to reestablish in full the sovereign power of the United States and to protect its security, its population, its economic resources, and its way of life.

We shall then have complete and well-documented briefs on both sides of this great issue. The issue can be clearly seen. The decision will be made where it should be made, in full and open debate, on the floor of Congress, with plenty of time for full discussion by men and women who are responsible to the electorate for their decisions. It will not be confused with the debate on the confirmation of the nomination of a judge who can only interpret the law as Congress has written it.

CONVICTION OF HARVEY MATUSOW

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as some of my colleagues may already know, Judge Thomason, of the United States district court, in El Paso, Tex., today found Harvey Matusow guilty of criminal contempt in his effort to obstruct justice in the case of Clinton Jencks. Judge Thomason sentenced Matusow to 3 years in prison. Appeal bond was set at $10,000.

Judge Thomason's conduct and actions in this matter have been refreshing, and wholly praiseworthy. What Judge Thomason has done cannot help but add luster to the Federal bench, and contribute to the confidence and respect which the people of America have for the Federal judiciary.

Matusow's conduct before the Federal court in Texas, as it has been reported, was, like his conduct before the Internal Security Subcommittee, which I witnessed, a shoddy and reprehensible performance. Matusow's efforts to sell a pack of lies to serve the purposes of the Communist conspiracy provided a nauseating spectacle.

Cross-comparison of what Matusow said in his affidavit in the Jencks case, what he told the Internal Security Subcommittee, what is stated in the book False Witness, which bears Matusow's name as author, and what Matusow told his publisher, Albert Kahn, during tape-recorded sessions in which the book was shaped up, shows not only the duplicity of Matusow and the complicity of Kahn, but also gives an excellent illustration of the intellectual dishonesty of the Communist mind.

In his affidavit, in the case of United States against Clinton E. Jencks, Matusow said:

> There was no basis for my stating that Clinton E. Jencks was a member of the Communist Party at the time I stated so in court.

The author of False Witness says in that book:

> I have stated on the witness stand that in July and August 1950 I had visited the San Cristobal Valley Ranch in Taos, N. Mex., and that I had met Jencks there. I testified that I had three conversations with him in which he told me he was a Communist Party member. Actually, there was no basis whatsoever for this statement of mine; and in January 1955 the lawyers for Jencks' defense received from me a sworn statement to that effect.

The following are excerpts from the hearing record of the Internal Security Subcommittee:

> Senator DANIEL. Do you deny that Jenny Wells Vincent and Craig Vincent were members of the Communist Party?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know them as Communists.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Clinton Jencks ever was a member of the Communist Party?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. Of my own knowledge?
>
> Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. No; I don't, sir.
>
> Mr. SOURWINE. When you first went to the San Cristobal Ranch in New Mexico in 1950, did you know it was operated by the Communist Party?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I did not.
>
> Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether it was operated by the Communist Party?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I didn't.
>
> Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know now whether it was then operated by the Communist Party?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, can you say concerning any of the persons you have named as having been met by you, or known by you at San Cristobal Valley Ranch that to your knowledge they were not Communists?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know one way or another, sir.

During the tape-recorded conversations between Matusow and Kahn, in advance of the actual writing of the book, but in preparation for writing the book, when Matusow was "talking it out" to Kahn, in accordance with outlines worked up by Kahn, the following colloquy took place:

> Mr. KAHN. Now let me ask you this for example—'cause I think this could come in well. You say in your testimony you met one of the Vincents at a Communist party—at the Albert Hotel. Now actually, what was that party?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I was being very flippant. I think I said it was a "hootnanny" or a "wingding." An affair put on by Peoples Artists. No, it's unimportant here what it was. It wasn't a Communist Party party. There's a difference, you see. I drew the line to myself. A Communist-front party—so it's a Communist party. I said Vincent was introduced to me as a Communist Party member. I wasn't introduced to him saying this is Craig Vincent. He is a party member. No, not like that. The intangible again. Vincent was a party member. I knew Vincent was a party member from talking to him. When I was expelled from the Communist Party, Vincent received the information from the party directly—through the party organization in New Mexico. I knew this, too. There was no doubt in my mind about Vincent's party membership. When—I mean that I can't say that I didn't—there was—I can't say that I really didn't know that Vincent was a party member. Then I'd be lying. I knew he was a party member and I said so. I knew Jencks was a party member and I said so. I can't say here that Jencks wasn't a party member after he signed the affidavits because I know that he was. But I shouldn't have testified. That's the important thing.
>
> Mr. KAHN. Why do you say you know he was?
>
> Mr. MATUSOW. I say I know he was—I mean in this way. Men like Ben Gold who

have been indicted on the same charge. He officially resigned from the Communist Party. Jencks also officially resigned from the party. Or he could have. Let's put it that way. But in—to my mind—then, in my thinking, it made him no less a Communist because he put a piece of paper down and said I'm no longer a member. As far as I was concerned, Jencks was still under Communist Party discipline. And there's a difference. He legally, according to the law, might not have been a member of the party. It didn't know that difference. Jencks didn't change his thinking because he issued that scrap of paper.

The same man who made that statement went on to tell an entirely different story in his book, and before the Internal Security Subcommittee, and in Judge Thomason's court in El Paso.

But the strategy of the forces behind Matusow has failed because of the honesty and integrity of a competent Federal judge. Once more, the system of American justice, at which the Communists scoff, and which they seek to pervert or destroy, has resisted a Communist onslaught and has emerged with vigor undiminished and with honor untarnished.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST TYRANNY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think I am enough of a nationalist not to be apt to become so concerned about foreign peoples as I do about Americans—as I have been concerned, for example, in the fate of the 526 American servicemen languishing in Chinese Communist dungeons. But I want to speak today about a matter involving foreign peoples, a matter that has weighed heavily on my mind for some time, as I am sure it has on other Senators' minds. I desire to talk about 100 million eastern Europeans, who are held captive by the international Communist tyranny. In a very real sense, these enslaved millions hold I O U's against the United States of America. These I O U's are not financial obligations; they are claims on our national honor.

We need not think of our obligation to Eastern Europe in altruistic terms—in terms of Uncle Sam's duty to dispense charity all over the world. The obligation is based rather on the solemn word of the United States—on pledges indelibly written in the books of history. It is also based on deeds, shameful deeds, committed by a Democrat administration in the name of the American people, at a small Russian town called Yalta.

The pledges I mention were noble pledges; and they had, I believe, the support of the American people. On August 12, 1941, on board an American warship in the mid-Atlantic, the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister issued a declaration, which—by the time we actually became involved in the Second World War—became the official statement of our war aims.

In the Atlantic Charter we said:

> We * * * desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the expressed wishes of the people concerned. * * * We respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and * * * we wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

ANNOUNCEMENT THAT YALTA AGREEMENTS ARE BEING MADE PUBLIC TODAY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment, in order that I may make an announcement?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is advised that the executive branch of the Government is making public today the Yalta agreements, and that a copy of the agreements will be sent to the committee for the use of the committee or for the use of anyone who wishes to inspect the agreements.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for yielding.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say that the agreements are being made public?

Mr. GEORGE. They are being made public today, and a copy is coming to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

In connection with his announcement, I believe I should point out that yesterday I discussed the matter of the Yalta papers with one of the very reputable officials of the State Department, and he admitted to me at times as many as 150 persons were engaged in the job of censoring the Yalta papers. He maintained that they had done a fine job of it; that they tried to go down the center; but he said he had to admit that a large number of persons were engaged in censoring the Yalta papers. So what the Senator will get will not be the entire picture of Yalta.

Mr. GEORGE. That may or may not be the case. I do not express any view on that statement. I am simply giving to the Senate the information as I received it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know the Senator is.

Mr. President, I continue with my statement.

I have read, Mr. President, our message of encouragement to people the world over whose liberty and homelands had been taken from them. The message did not fall on deaf ears—especially after America entered the war and put her military might behind her moral assurances. It was heard, for example, in Poland—gallant Poland, persuaded by her allies, as the war began, to wage, singlehandedly, a hopeless battle of resistance, yet willing to contribute the blood of her sons to the cause of freedom even after the homeland had been overcome by German arms and Soviet treachery. There can be no question that the decision of Polish divisions to join the fight abroad was prompted, in part, by America's promise that Poland's self-government and freedom would be restored. Then there was the heroic Warsaw uprising against such frightening odds in the summer of 1944. The battle would never have been undertaken were it not for the faith of the Poles in the promises of their allies. The indignant reaction in America to the barbaric and treacherous Soviet decision to let the uprising fail is proof we Americans intended at that time to vindicate the Poles' faith in us.

The story of Poland is only illustrative of what happened elsewhere in Eastern Europe. Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungaria, Czechoslavakia, Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia—all committed precious human lives and fortunes in support of underground guerrilla activities, trusting in our promises of deliverance. In Yugoslavia, for example, the valiant Chetniks, under General Mihailovitch, fought for 4 long years to preserve Yugoslav freedom against first the Nazi, then the Communist tyranny.

All of this sacrifice and devotion was, as I say, action in reliance on our promises. These people were encouraged to resist—not with the idea they would become Communist captives the moment they were rescued from the Nazis, but rather with the idea that they would be permitted to hold their heads high and walk in freedom again.

But, Mr. President, then came the great betrayal. As the war was drawing to a close, 3 men—Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joe Stalin—men whose 3 countries were committed to the Atlantic Charter's guaranty that freedom and self-determination would be restored to the conquered peoples of Europe—met at Yalta and calmly decided to hand over 100 million human beings to the Soviet tyranny. The master plotter was, of course, the bandit Stalin. But the blame for the treachery is shared equally by the heads of the 2 western democracies who, with hardly a whisper of protest, consented, "in the interest of world unity," to put 10 nations in chains.

That deed, Mr. President, stained American honor as has no other deed in history.

The magnitude of the deed was only gradually appreciated. But when the truth about the Yalta agreement came to light, America was angry, her conscience was stung. Although most of us had nothing to do with the treachery, we had been committed by our leaders to the wrong, and so we were determined to undo the wrong.

The Republican Party decided to take steps to salvage American honor. In its platform of 1952 the Republican Party declared that if we were elected we would repudiate the Yalta agreement. We made a solemn pledge to the American people that if they should see fit to give us the reigns of Government, we would undertake to retrieve American honor. Repudiation of Yalta was a part, but a very important part, of our program to put America on the initiative in the world fight against Communism and to give our policies a moral tone that they had theretofore lacked. It was a part of the great policy of liberation to which, as a party, we pledged ourselves. I wonder how we will explain this in 1956 as we again campaign for office. I read

new from the Republican platform of 1952:

Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam were the scenes of those tragic blunders with others to follow. The leaders of the administration in power acted without the knowledge or consent of Congress or of the American people. They traded our overwhelming victory for a new enemy and for new oppressions and new wars which were quick to come.

* * * * *

The Government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings, such as those of Yalta, which aid Communist enslavements. It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples.

We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of containment which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism, which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.

Thus we promised to repudiate Yalta and the policy of containment.

It will be remembered that, depending upon the word of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, Republican candidates all over the country promised a new foreign policy. We told the American people that the Truman-Acheson-Marshall policy of containment was ineffectual practically and contemptible morally. We said—and some speeches of ringing eloquence were made on this subject by the Presidential candidate and his choice for Secretary of State—that it was not enough merely to attempt to hold the line, but America must set her sights on the liberation of the enslaved peoples of the world.

Of course, a liberation policy was 100 percent inconsistent with the Yalta agreement which formally authorized slavery. Thus, as a first step toward liberation, we pledged ourselves to erase the black stain of Yalta. That was our solemn promise to the American people.

Today—nearly 2½ years after the American people registered their approval of the Republican platform—what does the record show? How does the Republican Party's performance stack up against its promises? The record, I regret to say, is no credit to the Republican Party. Yalta has not been repudiated. Our word has not been made good.

Let me say in this connection that it is not easy for me to criticize the Republican Party, and I suppose it would be shrewd not to do so. I have been told on a great number of occasions by my friends that I ought to desist from criticizing Republicans. I have been told that that is the surest path to political oblivian. Perhaps it is, Mr. President. So what? What is my job as a United States Senator, just to survive? I remind my Republican colleagues that I, and they, too, stumped the country in 1952—we addressed audiences from New York to California, from New Orleans to St. Paul—on the theme that the Democrats had a record of placing party above country.

Mr. President, may we have order? I wonder whether the function of the Chair is to keep order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Chair wonders whether he has to enter into a discussion with the Senator from Wisconsin about the function of the Chair. There is order in the Chamber.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we claimed—and I think with voluminous evidence to support us—that many Democrats had put their personal political fortunes ahead of principle and the national interest. How are we to interpret our election? As a mandate to go ahead and do precisely what we had accused the Democrats of doing? I think not. I am a Republican, root and center, first and last. But I think the honor, as well as the success, of the Republican Party depends upon our playing square with the American people. So I say to my friends—to my practical friends—who advise me to go easy on Republicans, that, frankly, I am not optimistic of our chances in 1956 if we go before the American people with a series of broken campaign promises.

Let me hasten to add that the Republican Party as a whole is not to blame in this respect. It was only a matter of days after a Republican administration took office and a Republican majority was installed in Congress—in January of 1953—that a resolution repudiating the Yalta agreement was framed. That resolution, initially, had the support of a vast majority of Republicans in Congress. But it was not passed. It was not passed, in part, because the Democrats were opposed to it. At the margin, however, we must admit that the resolution failed because powerful pressure from the State Department and from the White House discouraged certain Republicans from supporting it.

I have no way of knowing the motives of the administration. But I can make some educated guesses about them. I would guess that the answer lies in the disposition and in the power of certain entrenched bureaucrats in the State Department, for repudiation of Yalta meant repudiation of them.

These men were holdovers from the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson days. They are the likes of Charles Bohlen, who, as will be recalled, was made the Eisenhower administration's Ambassador to Russia, notwithstanding the fact that at Yalta he represented the State Department's Eastern European Division, and notwithstanding the fact that as late as 1953 he stoutly defended Yalta. These holdovers from the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson regime exert a powerful influence on the shaping of American foreign policy even today. Some of them, unfortunately, are as inclined today to appease international communism as they were in 1945.

Not all, however, are holdovers from the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson regime. A man whose advice is accepted above that of anyone else at the White House is Milton Eisenhower. My authority for this is President Eisenhower himself. Here is what he had to say in the New York Times of October 1, 1950:

I consider Milton to be a great liberal in the best sense of the word. I look on a liberal as a man trying to meet the problems of his day while still recognizing the indispensable requirements that we preserve human dignity and freedom.

The man's breadth of experience is really quite a remarkable thing. He is at once at home with ideas and also so practical. I ask his advice in things where I'm anxious to get down exactly what I mean. I think I'd rather take his views than those of anyone else. He's a unique baby brother—he's got the respect of all the older ones.

Who is Milton Eisenhower, who exerts such a tremendous influence on our foreign policy. Perhaps to get a picture of him, we should quote, from the Tydings committee hearings, Esther Brunauer reading a letter from Milton Eisenhower. Esther Brunauer was one of those I named as a security risk, and who was removed from the State Department on security grounds. I quote from page 299 of the Tydings Committee hearings:

Mrs. BRUNAUER. Yes. Then I have one more, Mr. Chairman, from Judge Marion J. Harron, who has known me since I was in high school. May I also read a personal letter from Mr. Milton Eisenhower. He said—

And now I read the letter from Milton Eisenhower to Esther Brunauer, who was "canned" from the State Department as a security risk because of her Communist connections—

DEAR ESTHER: I am happy you wrote me, because I have been so angry about the McCarthy charges that I have been wanting to take some kind of action. You give me the very opportunity I need. The first letter I wrote for you just smoked with adjectives. Then I decided you didn't want that kind of testimonial, so I send the attached very calm letter. If it isn't exactly what you want, please let me know at once.

I will see you in April at the commission meeting.

Incidentally, Mrs. Brunauer's husband was a close friend of Noel Field, who disappeared behind the Iron Curtain, and was dropped from the Navy Department because of Communist connections.

Then there was Owen Lattimore. I quote from page 224 of the McCarran committee report, where he is described:

Owen Lattimore was, from some time beginning in the 1930's a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy.

Here is the letter in full, from Milton to "dear Owen":

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF
AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
Manhattan, October 22, 1943.

Mr. OWEN LATTIMORE,
Director, Pacific Operations,
Office of War Information,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR OWEN: Thanks a lot for your informative letter. To tell you the truth, I was a little ashamed of myself not to have the appropriate information at my finger tips when Captain Arthur Farrell made the statements he did. Anyway, I now have the information direct from you and will be prepared for the next occasion.

Since I have been home here in Kansas I have made three rather extensive talks on

psychological warfare throughout the world and I talk on domestic war information. The audiences have been keenly interested and subsequent to the discussions have indicated a friendly attitude toward OWI.

Nothing would please me more than to have you stop in Manhattan when you are on one of your trips from Frisco to Washington. I do not mean to impose unduly on my friends but I am willing to impose on them a little. It would not only be fun to have a visit with you but I should like to have you carry on a few forum discussions at the College. You have had so much experience along this line that I needn't tell you that you would enjoy it. Of course you would.

Sincerely,

MILTON
M. S. Eisenhower.

I mention Milton Eisenhower merely because he is typical of the palace guard of New Dealers which lead Ike around without his ever knowing exactly where they are taking him.

Mr. President, the hour is growing late. A number of Senators have indicated that they are eager to reach a vote on the Harlan nomination. I understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered, so Senators do not wish to leave the Chamber. I indicated to one Senator that after I had progressed to a certain point in my speech I would be willing to have the rest of it inserted in the body of the RECORD, the same as though given, and yield the floor for a vote. So I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator inserting his statement in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remainder of the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The remainder of Mr. MCCARTHY's statement is as follows:

What the White House offered as an alternative to repudiating Yalta was that Congress verbally slap the wrists of the Communists by reproaching the Soviet Union for having breached the Yalta Agreement. This was the administration's way of making good on our campaign promises.

Do not get me wrong. The Communists should be criticized for going even farther toward enslaving people than we had expressly agreed to let them go. But that sort of thing is old hat. The Communists have an unblemished record of breaking every agreement they have ever made as long as it is in their interest to do so. The American people know this and have known it for a long time. We Republicans did not waste our breath talking about that during the 1952 campaign. We talked rather about the agreements themselves, and pointed out that they were evil. What we Americans did in signing the agreements was evil. I ask my good friends not to be misled by that strange version of morality which says it is wrong for us to denounce Yalta because we always should keep agreements we have made. If you and I agree that together we will murder someone and later you realize that what you did was wrong, the way to redeem yourself is not to say "I will stick by my agreement," but rather "I will denounce the agreement and do whatever I can to prevent the murder."

Let us be very clear about why what we did was wrong, and why we are being dishonest with ourselves when we blame the Communists for doing pretty much what we agreed they could do.

At Yalta we agreed in effect that the Communists could have Poland. Let me refresh the minds of Senators as to the situation in Poland at that time. As you will recall, there were two claimants to the Government of Poland: one, the so-called Lublin Provisional Government, which was nothing more than a committee of Communists appointed by the Soviet Union to take over Poland, and the other, the officially recognized Polish Government-in-exile, which had its headquarters in London. Before Yalta it was the view of the American and British delegations that representatives of the Lublin group and the London Government should meet, and then under the direct supervision of all the Allied Powers should conduct free elections. I may say that even then we were promoting the unrealistic idea of a coalition government, including Communists; but at least we had the good sense to propose that any elections be supervised by Americans and British along with the Russians. But this proposal was distasteful to the Communists, so we agreed to what Stalin wanted. I now quote from the Yalta protocol, which we signed:

"The provisional government (meaning the Communists) which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and Poles abroad. This new government should then be called the Polish Porvisional Government of National Unity."

In other words, the Communists were to be recognized as the de facto rulers of Poland. They agreed, of course, to reorganize themselves on a broader democratic basis. But no provision was made for enforcing that commitment. And no reasonable man could possibly believe that, if left to their own devices, the Communists would permit anti-Communists to join the Government. As a practical matter, we gave the Soviet Union and its Communist puppets a blank check. And the Communists, of course, proceeded as expected. The first delegates from the London government to arrive in Poland for the purpose of participating in the government—15 Polish Army officers—were quickly shipped off to Russia and shot.

At Yalta it was agreed that the eastern provinces of Poland should be handed over lock, stock, and barrel to the Soviet Union. This was to reward Russia, as Sir Winston Churchill has put it, for "her great deeds in * * * liberating Poland." Churchill did not explain how you can liberate a country and annex it at the same time.

At Yalta we agreed that Poland should take substantial areas of territory in the north and west. This meant that Poland would get, as she has gotten, huge sections of German territory, populated by Germans, in compensation for Russia's grab of Polish territory in the east. The result was that close to 9 million Germans had to leave their homes and try to find room to the west in order to avoid being ruled by an alien power.

At Yalta we agreed that Marshal Tito and his Communist followers should organize a government for Yugoslavia. The heroic Chetniks of General Mikhailovich, who had fought for so long and so valiantly against Nazis, Fascists, and Communists alike, were abandoned—and given the status of criminals.

At Yalta we agreed that the future of the other nations of eastern Europe—Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—should be decided by the Soviet Union. There was no specific mention of this in the Yalta protocol. But since, in the words of the protocol, a "general review of other Balkan questions" was undertaken at Yalta, and since no provision was made for America and Britain joining in setting up new governments for these countries, the only possible inference is that explicitly, or by default, Roosevelt and Churchill secretly agreed to give Russia the same free rein in the remainder of eastern Europe as she was allowed in Poland and Yugoslavia.

At Yalta we agreed that $20 billion be exacted from Germany in reparations—half of which was to go to the Soviet Union.

At Yalta we agreed that the Communists could physically cart away to the Soviet Union 80 percent of German industry located in the Russian Zone. Think what that meant. Think what it would mean if the United States were, all of a sudden, deprived of 80 percent of all its factories, its machinery, its machine tools, its rolling stock of railways, its investments in foreign enterprises, and so on. Think what it meant for Germany, already ruined by the physical devastation of war. This was to be our way of rebuilding Europe.

At Yalta we agreed—and this I regard as the most appalling commitment of all, the darkest blemish American honor has ever sustained—we agreed that "the use of labor" was to be part of Germany's reparation contribution. That deadly phrase to which we signed our name permitted the Communists to ship off hundreds of thousands—probably millions—of human beings as slave laborers to the Soviet Union. I can think of no greater crime against humanity.

At Yalta we agreed that war criminals should be tried and brought to justice. By this commitment we authorized the notorious Nuremberg trials, so courageously opposed at the time by the late Senator Taft. We committed ourselves to a rule of ex post facto law, theretofore utterly foreign to America's system of jurisprudence.

And finally at Yalta we agreed—and this part of the agreement was labeled "Top Secret" and carefully concealed from the public mind until months afterward—we agreed, with respect to the Far East, that the Kurile Islands should be handed over to Russia, that the southern half of Sakhalin Island should be given to Russia, that the Soviets should be allowed to occupy the northern half of Korea, that the port of Darien should be internationalized; that Russia should be given Port Arthur, and that the Soviet Union should be given pre-eminent rights in Manchuria. Why was this part of the agreement kept secret? For the very good reason that the Republic of China, perhaps our most trusted ally, had not been told that we were giving away her territory to the Soviet Union. It was not wise to run the risk of discouraging Chiang's war effort by telling him, while the war was going on, that we had bargained away his country. What monstrous treachery.

Do Senators see why it is intolerable that the good name of America should remain affixed to this infamous document? Compare what was done at Yalta with our declaration in the Atlantic Charter that we "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," and that we "respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live" and still again that we "wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

At Yalta they compromised our integrity; they made off with American honor. I hold that it is our solemn obligation to rescue American honor.

The Republican Party is so pledged. I would have the Republican Party make good on all of its pledges. I would have the Republican Party recall that it promised to the American people in 1952 a policy of liberation. Such a policy requires absolutely the repudiation of Yalta.

It also requires—and I wish to make this additional point because the subject is so timely—it also requires that we support the Republic of China in this, its hour of great

need. It requires that we encourage the Chinese to hope and plan for the rescue of their homeland from its oppressors. I said in Chicago, several weeks ago, and it bears repeating now, that the Eisenhower administration has ordered the Republic of China to retreat. I said that the Eisenhower administration, at the behest of the British, forced free China to abandon the Tachen Islands, and that there is evidence that the strongest sort of pressure is being brought to bear to compel Chiang to abandon also Quemoy and the Matsus. I said that this attitude on the part of the administration represents not only an attempt to appease communism and our alleged allies, but also indicates a final decision not to permit free China to even attempt to liberate the mainland.

At a recent press conference when asked whether we would support Chiang if and when he invaded the Communist controlled mainland, the President said, according to the New York Times of March 3, 1955:

"The United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war; that is the best answer I can make."

So what during the campaign was called "rolling back the Communist" now becomes aggressive war by the Republic of China.

Neither are our British friends reticent to state a like position. Let me read a statement made just 5 days ago by the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Anthony Eden. After telling a cheering House of Parliament that a peaceful Formosa settlement would result in the West giving fresh consideration to Red China's claims to a seat in the United Nations, Eden went on to compliment the United States for helping to pacify the Formosa situation. Eden said:

"They (meaning the United States) have effectively restrained the Chinese Nationalists in recent weeks from initiating attacks against the Chinese mainland. They have persuaded the Nationalists to evacuate the Tachen and Nanchi Islands."

Is this the way the Eisenhower administration proposes to make good on its promise to pursue a policy of liberation?

I recommend to the President of the United States that he reread his campaign speeches of 1952—and those of his Secretary of State. I remind the President that his administration is pledged to a policy of liberation—not coexistence. The first step in charting such a policy is to denounce the infamous deal made at Yalta. I call upon President Eisenhower immediately to announce the support of his administration for formal congressional action repudiating the Yalta Agreements.

I myself have reintroduced such a resolution in the Senate.

There was a time when America was much weaker physically than she is today, but oh, how much stronger morally. Let us recover our moral strength. Let us keep faith with ourselves and with the millions of people in Asia and Europe whom, at Yalta, we helped consign to slavery. Let us set as our goal the redemption of American honor.

Twenty-seven months have passed since we Republicans have been in charge of the Nation's affairs. And despite the solemn commitments of our party to repudiate the illegal acts of the previous administrations, nothing has been done. Today more than ever it is essential that the President of the United States, in keeping with the platform of his party, should reject formally the treason of the past. The coming to office of the Republican Party gave new hope to tens of millions of enslaved people to whom our Voice had broadcast our platform such as it will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of containment which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism. Chinese, Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, and East Germans have all been awaiting the accomplishment of the enunciated rollback policy, but they have heard nothing in these last 27 months. They are beginning to believe that the American Nation in which they have pinned their hopes has forgotten and abandoned them.

An immediate repudiation of the Yalta agreements which enslaved them would renew their confidence in the future and in the United States. Also, the Moscovites are eager now to sign a peace treaty with the Japanese. Soviet and Japanese delegates will meet in New York sometime next month to discuss conditions of such a treaty which may result in Japan getting into the Soviet sphere of influence. A denunciation of the Yalta agreement would have its immediate effect to nullify the Russian illegal occupation of the Kuriles and southern Sahkalin Islands, Japanese territories handed over to the U. S. S. R. by Mr. Roosevelt without the constitutional processes of the United States, that is to say the approval of the American Senate. It would give the Japanese Government a powerful weapon to be able to ask the Moscovites to move out of the islands in order to obtain the peace treaty they are so eagerly seeking now.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOMINATION OF JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN

The Senate, in executive session, resumed the consideration of the nomination of John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had some remarks prepared with reference to the pending question. However, in view of the lateness of the hour and the possibility of coming to a quick vote, I shall be very brief indeed.

After making a study, with deep concern, of the trend or drift for the past several years with reference to appointments to the Supreme Court, I finally prepared a short bill, which I introduced 2 days ago. It attempts to provide some kind of standard, some kind of guide, some kind of bench mark by announcing the policy the Congress believes the President should follow in making such appointments. In preparing and introducing the bill I had no personal reference to the present Chief Executive or to the nominee.

I was deeply impressed by the idea that the Constitution of the United States puts strong and binding limitations on the Chief Executive with reference to his general executive powers and imposes great limitations on Congress with reference to its legislative powers, but prescribes no guide, no rule, and no plan with reference to selecting associate justices of the Supreme Court, the branch of our Government which has become the most powerful of the three.

I was impressed by the fact that when the President of the United States makes an appointment of a minister or ambassador, he may recall him at any time he sees fit. A Cabinet member may be recalled during his term of service. The Congress itself may cut off funds. But when a person is appointed a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, the appointment is irrevocable. He is beyond the reach of the President of the United States. He is beyond the reach of Congress. He has a life tenure. It is a position of accumulated power over the decades, the like of which is not found in any other government in the world.

It is true that what nine men say about a statute of Congress or about the constitution of a State or with reference to any legal principle, theory, or policy is the final word and the final law. For that reason, long before the present nominee's name was mentioned—and I cast no aspersions or reflections on him—I said I was convinced of the need of a Supreme Court composed, at least in half, of men of mature judgment who have had experience as jurists; and that I would not vote to confirm the nomination of anyone who did not meet those qualifications. For that reason I shall vote against the confirmation of the nominee in this instance.

I submit to the membership of the Senate that this long-neglected subject is one of the most demanding in government today. We should prescribe some standard whereby there will be assurance, as appointments are made from time to time, that at least half of the number of nominees for the Supreme Court will have already been seasoned and matured as judges of law and will have had a thoroughly developed judicial concept before they become members of the highest court of the land and are invested with an irrevocable power.

I hope that Congress will consider the question of passing such a measure such as I have proposed for the guidance of future Presidents.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, and one who was present at most of the hearings before the committee, I shall take only a few minutes to explain my position on the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan.

I first became acquainted with Judge Harlan in 1950 or 1951, when he was appointed counsel for the New York State Crime Commission. I followed his work as counsel for that commission. He handled himself in a judicial manner. He was thorough. He was effective. He served without compensation. I thought he as counsel and the members of the commission did a most commendable job. There is no question about his legal ability or his aptitude or his capacity to be a member of the Supreme Court.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the objections which have been made to the confirmation of his nomination, particularly on the ground that he was associated with an organiza-

tion designed to lend support to the United Nations, and also that he served on the advisory committee of the Atlantic Union Committee. I am not a member of the Atlantic Union Committee. But I wish to say that its officers and directors and those who have supported it are among the outstanding Americans of our time. They are men and women of both poltical parties.

My only partial criticism of Judge Harlan is that in the testimony he was slightly apologetic for his interest in the United Nations or in the Atlantic Union Committee. I would think more of Judge Harlan if he had straightforwardly and enthusiastically presented his suport of these two great efforts.

In my opinion, a person, a lawyer or a private citizen, who exercises influence in forming public opinion and in the guidance of the Nation, should have an interest in civic matters, indeed, in general political problems, and in our effort to have something better than wars every 25 years, and to have our Nation furnish leadership looking toward peace with honor. I would look with a great deal of suspicion upon an able man in private life who did not use his energy and some of his intelligence and ability toward trying to make this a world in which we will have a chance to live at peace.

Therefore, Mr. President, rather than being crticized, in my opinion the efforts Judge Harlan has made in some advisory capacity on behalf of the United Nations, or being interested in it at least, as well as in the Atlantic Union, should be commended.

Mr. President, I do not wish to retry the Bricker amendment. However, let me say that so far as the Atlantic Union resolution is concerned, I have felt for a long time that unless we can have some political implementation of the NATO treaty, and of the nine-power agreement, which is now being considered by various nations in connection with a military alliance, and unless we can have consultations upon economic and political matters and foreign-policy matters, I am afraid we will not be taking effective steps to hold together the free world. That must be done if we are to have peace.

What the resolution does, and all it does, is to request the President—and the President can heed the request or ignore it—to call a meeting of the interested nations so that they may determine what else can be done. It is purely exploratory. There is need of more discussions between our allies and ourselves. We need to explore what we can do to hold the free nations together, to reduce differences of opinion, and to stand united in the face of Communist unity which is threatening the peace of the world.

Mr. President, I respect the attitude of those who oppose the nomination of Judge Harlan, but I saw nothing in the hearings which indicated that he is not capable, that he does not have the proper concept with reference to the Constitution, or that as a private citizen he has not done his duty to his community and to the country. So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly with reference to the nomination of Judge Harlan.

I do not doubt the legal ability of Judge Harlan. He is a member of one of the important law firms of this Nation and has been employed by those who would not have other than the best legal talent of this Nation to represent them. I have no question as to the personal character of Judge Harlan. The fact that he was selected to head the probe of crime conditions in New York attests to his character and standing in his own State. But I have become increasingly concerned over the appointment to the highest court of this land, a court from whose decisions there is no appeal, of those who have had no judicial experience whatever or such limited judicial experience that it has not grown into the maturity which comes from long service on the bench. There are other qualifications for service on the Supreme Court of the United States than mere brilliance of intellect or power of advocacy at the bar. The maturity of a real judge derives from judicial experience and judicial restraint. The willingness to decide questions as the judge finds the law to be, rather than to attempt to write the law as the judge feels it should be, is one of the most important characteristics of a judge of a court of last resort, from which there is no appeal.

The Supreme Court, I may say, Mr. President, has been assuming more and more power and infringing more and more on the prerogatives of the legislative branch of the Government in recent years.

Mr. President, this restraint can be acquired only by serving on a court whose decisions are subject to review.

I do not propose, Mr. President, to vote to advise and consent to the nomination of any judge to the Supreme Court bench who has not had considerable judicial experience under the restraint of precedent. There should be some members of that bench who believe that precedent plays a part in the organization of our judicial system and the decisions of our courts and who think that the doctrine of stare decisis has vadility and value even to a court of last resort.

I have always been very loath to oppose any nominations submitted to this body by the Chief Executive of the Nation. Our views are colored by our own experiences. As Governor of my State I have had some experience in dealing with the confirmation of nominations which has caused me generally to support the Chief Executive, of whatever party he may be, in proposing nominations to this body. I would be the last to abuse the power of advice and consent which is lodged in this body. But, in my opinion, Mr. President, the power to advise and consent which was vested in the Senate was wisely placed here by the Founding Fathers to deal with just such a situation as we find in this instance. There are many able judges of broad experience who have been seasoned in the restrain of precedent in this country who are available for appointment to the Supreme Court. There are many of them on the United States circuit court of appeals. We find them in Federal district courts. I doubt not that the courts of last resort in every State in the Union have men of broad and long experience who are well qualified to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States. For my part, I propose, with such authority and such responsibility as I have under the power of advice and consent, to oppose the nomination of men to the Supreme Court who play such a vital part in shaping the life of our Nation, affecting our economy and the very structure of our business, as well as our individual rights, unless they have experienced the restraint of precedent.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Georgia that of the 8 present members of the Supreme Court of the United States, only 1 had as much as a single second's judicial experience on an appellate court or a court of general jurisdiction prior to his elevation to his present position?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite confident that the statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is correct. I do not intend to go into the composition of the Supreme Court at the present time. I voted for the confirmation of the nominations of all the present members of the Supreme Court except the present Chief Justice; but I stated publicly in my own State, in the fall of 1953, that so long as I was in the Senate, I did not intend to vote for the confirmation to the Supreme Court of any person who was without judicial experience until there were some seasoned members of that body. I frankly have erred in doing so in previous instances.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if, in his judgment, it is not essential to the proper functioning of any appellate court that the court be composed of members who, by reason of prior judicial experience, have acquired both the capacity and the willingness to subject themselves to the restraint which is inherent in the judicial process itself when the judicial process is properly understood and applied.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not say that that applied to every appellate court; but certainly I think it applies to a court of last resort, from which there is no appeal; a court which has sweeping power over the lives of the American people, power which has been either vested in or assumed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a matter of deep importance to the people of the United States. For many weeks the Committee on the Judiciary has been studying the nomination of Judge Harlan to be a member of the Supreme Court. As I recall, the Committee on the Judiciary

made a divided report, 4 members voting not to confirm the nomination of Judge Harlan, and 1 member refraining from voting at that particular time. That action convinces me that the Senate should, at least, think over the question very seriously.

I regret I am unable to vote to confirm the nomination of Judge John Marshall Harlan to be a Justice of the Supreme Court.

He appears to be a gentleman of considerable ability and of high character. In some respects, I believe he might make an able Justice. When questioned, however, as to whether he would construe the provisions of a treaty to be subordinate to the provisions of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, he would not commit himself, stating that that question might come before him in his judicial capacity and that it might be improper for him to state an advance opinion. I think such a question is vital and paramount, involving a principal of our Government rather than a disputed question of fact or law which that might thereafter come before the Court for its decision. Judge Harlan's unwillingness to declare himself in advance on that abstract important question completely foreclosed me from favoring his nomination.

I notice that the vote of the eight Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States in the cemetery case resulted in a tie, thus allowing the decision of the Iowa Supreme Court upholding the contract in controversy to stand. In that case, four Justices took the position that the United Nations Charter is a treaty which can override the contractual rights secured to citizens under decisions so ancient that they are a part of the American tradition and inheritance.

If by our action we allow to be placed on the Supreme Court a member having the background of Judge Harlan, I believe that the rulings of the Supreme Court in the future in such matters will be 5 to 4.

I think the provisions of the Treaty made under the Constitution are in the same category as is any law passed by Congress; and that when any contest or issue is raised as between the provisions of the Constitution, on the one hand, and the laws of Congress or the provisions of treaty, on the other hand, the latter should be subordinated to the provisions of the Constitution.

I am a fundamentalist and a strict constructionist. Moreover, I adhere strongly to the doctrine of States rights. There are too many people today who are either willing to forget or entirely fail to appreciate the fact that our States existed before the Federal Union was formed; and that the Bill of Rights is a part of the fundamental law of the land. Too many people are willing to overlook the fact that the rights not conferred on the Federal Government have been retained by the people of our States.

There is also a tendency in the United States today to be international-minded, instead of thinking first of our own Nation.

While I strongly favor our association with other Nations by a Treaty such as NATO, SEATO, and the United Nations, I am entirely unwilling to submit the individual rights of the American people, guaranteed to them by the provisions of the Constitution, to the whims and caprices of those unfamiliar with our national origin or who do not enjoy or understand the blessings guaranteed to us by the Constitution.

This country owes its progress and the high state of civilization we enjoy to the sacrifices made by our forebears, all of which they charted for us in the liberties provided for us by the Constitution.

I do not favor judicial legislation any more than I do executive legislation. Many lawyers have complained, and I agree with them, that a number of the recent decisions of our Supreme Court have had the effect of judicial legislation. If our form of Government is to be changed or our Constitution needs changing, I believe the change should be in the manner provided for in the Constitution, rather than by any loose, strained interpretation or covert construction of it.

For these reason, briefly stated, I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Harlan. I believe that if we do not stop, look, and listen, at the present time, and put on the brakes, so to speak, with respect to the "international crowd," we shall be certain to give up the rights of our States and our Nation under the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Mansfield
Allott	Frear	Martin, Iowa
Anderson	Fulbright	Martin, Pa.
Barkley	Goldwater	McCarthy
Barrett	Gore	McClellan
Beall	Green	Millikin
Bender	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bricker	Hill	Neuberger
Bush	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hruska	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Cotton	Kefauver	Smathers
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kilgore	Stennis
Dirksen	Knowland	Thurmond
Douglas	Kuchel	Thye
Duff	Langer	Watkins
Dworshak	Lehman	Welker
Eastland	Long	Wiley
Ellender	Magnuson	Williams
Ervin	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. [MURRAY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachuetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 11, as follows.

YEAS—71

Aiken	Dworshak	Long
Allott	Ellender	Magnuson
Anderson	Flanders	Malone
Barkley	Frear	Mansfield
Barrett	Fulbright	Martin, Iowa
Beall	Goldwater	Martin, Pa.
Bender	Gore	McCarthy
Bennett	Green	Millikin
Bible	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler	Holland	Neuberger
Byrd	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Ives	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Potter
Chavez	Jenner	Purtell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cotton	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kerr	Thye
Daniel	Kilgore	Watkins
Dirksen	Knowland	Wiley
Douglas	Kuchel	Williams
Duff	Lehman	

NAYS—11

Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Thurmond
Hill	Russell	Welker
Johnston, S. C.	Smathers	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Murray	Sparkman
George	Saltonstall	Symington
Kennedy	Schoeppel	Young
McNamara	Scott	

So the nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination of John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether we can pass over the nomination of Mr. Campbell, which it is planned to take up on Friday, and at this time consider the other nominations on the calendar, regarding which I believe there is no controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar, following that of Mr. Campbell, be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The next nomination will be stated.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lama A. DeMunbrun, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Postmaster nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make for the information of the Senate: In accordance with agreement between the leadership, it is planned when the Senate concludes its business this evening that it take a recess until Friday at noon. At that time the Senate will be in executive session, and will proceed to consider the nomination of Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General.

When that nomination is acted upon, it is planned to have the Senate consider certain resolutions coming from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Previously I have made announcement regarding those resolutions.

When the Senate concludes the consideration of the various resolutions coming from the Committee on Rules and Administration, it is planned to have the Senate consider the cotton bill, coming from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

When the Senate has concluded with that business, it is planned to take up the postal pay bill, and then to take up the classified pay bill—reserving the right, of course, to bring up, in between, any matters of an unusual or emergency nature. But as nearly as we can anticipate, that will be our program for the next several days.

I rather think the Senate will be in session only on Friday of this week. The pay bills will not be considered, of course, until some time next week—probably on Monday or later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have had prior consultation with the distinguished majority leader, and he has informed me of this general program; and of course I thoroughly approve of it.

As I understand the situation, after the Executive Calendar, including the nomination of Mr. Campbell, is cleared, and after action on the resolutions, the cotton bill will be brought up; and presumably at the beginning of the week we shall consider the postal pay bill and the classified pay bill. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, that is our plan—unless some other matter intervenes in the meantime.

But I think we should give the Members the assurance—and although I have not consulted with my friend across the aisle, if he is agreeable to having me give the assurance, I shall do so—that there will be no votes on the pay bills this week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the Senator from Texas is prepared at this point to indicate the situation over Good Friday and the Easter weekend. I have had a number of requests from various Senators in connection with that situation, and I know he has been most obliging in making as early an announcement as possible. I did not know whether any final conclusion had been reached along the lines we had previously discussed tentatively. If he is not prepared to make such an announcement, that will be agreeable to me; but I thought he might be prepared to make one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from California; he is always considerate in that way.

I had hoped, as I know a number of other Members have, that—perhaps by way of resolution—we could get away for a definite period during the Easter season. However, because of the uncertainties in regard to certain important legislative matters in certain committees, we felt we could not give any assurances at this time that we would have a recess for a period longer than from Thursday before Good Friday until Tuesday following Easter Sunday—in short, from Thursday to Tuesday. Of course it would be necessary for the Senate to return on Monday, but we would do so with the understanding that no votes would be taken on Monday, although there would be opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD, and to submit similar routine matters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say to the Senator from California that if the Reciprocal Trade Act extension bill or some of the other more important measures are not ready for action by the Senate at that time, it may be that we shall amend our plan, and shall consider having a more extended recess, such as the one the House of Representatives takes each year.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas mean the Senate will not be in session on Thursday before Good Friday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; the Senate will be in session on Thursday, and will take a recess from Thursday afternoon until the following Monday, but with the understanding that no votes will be taken before Tuesday afternoon, although the Senate will be in session on Monday.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is one matter, which may be privileged, namely, the one dealing with the disposal of the rubber plants. I think the deadline, if the Senate is to act on that matter, is the 25th, which I believe will be a week from tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Nothing which is scheduled would keep that matter from being taken up. As I remember, the statute provides that any Member can call it up.

Mr. CAPEHART. But if any action is to be taken on it, it must be taken between now and next Thursday.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess, in executive session, until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—REPORT OF HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I venture to intrude on the time of the Senate for approximately two and one-half minutes to discuss an issue which is extremely important to the people of my State, if I may judge from the many communications received in my office.

Mr. President, last Monday the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch issued a report on Federal lending agencies which recommends drastic curtailment of the services these agencies render to important segments of the national economy.

This Commission, set up by the present administration, is headed by former President Hoover and has become known as "the Hoover Commission"—a name which is associated in the public mind with the respect and confidence earned by the accomplishments of its predecessor, the original Hoover Commission. The latter group, created by President Harry S. Truman, made studies and recommendations to improve the efficiency of executive agencies and commissions of the Federal Government.

But, Mr. President, any popular confusion betwen that original Hoover Commission and the present one would be a grievous mistake, although, perhaps, it was intended that the good name of the former would be useful in glossing over the undesirable policies recommended by the present group.

The original Hoover Commission devoted itself fastidiously to problems of administration and efficient management, refusing to enter into matters of substantive policy. The present Commission makes far-reaching recommendations to change, curtail or abolish long-established national policies under the guise of furthering efficiency.

This is an unwarranted intrusion into areas of important national policies. An illustration of this, to take one example, is the present Commission's recommendations concerning the rural electrification program.

It is evident, Mr. President, that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission propose to return America to the old law of tooth and fang. The report suggests that the REA "secure its financing from private sources." This would raise by many millions of dollars the interest rates paid by farmers on the poles, wires, and transformers bringing electricity to their farms. It would put our farmers again at the mercy of the banks and utilities which left them without lights prior to the Roosevelt administration.

WHY ENDANGER FARM ELECTRICITY?

It appears that since financial soundness of supplying the power needs of rural families has been proved by REA, those interests which refused to finance farm service two decades ago now covet the rural power market. Their influence on formulating views of the task force cannot be ignored.

In 1933 only 27 percent of Oregon's farms had electric lights. By 1952—under the favorable impact of the Rural Electrification Administration—98 percent of our farms had central service, and most of this at reasonable rates. The Hoover Commission would end this magnificent record, which has brought the blessings of electricity to our Oregon farm people—and particularly for the women on the farms, who have been relieved of the drudgery of hand-washing of clothes and of cooking with kindling.

Many rural electric co-ops still must expand their service, as the population of our State increases, because it is one of the fastest-growing States in the Union. This requires further loans from the REA and more low-cost power. But the national administration, under Secretary McKay, already has cut down Bonneville's supply of power by choking off all new Federal "starts" in the Pacific Northwest. Not content with this sabotage, the Hoover Commission now proposes restrictions which would limit REA as a favorable factor in the lives of our farm families.

The Commission's meat-ax approach is deplorable. It is apparent that the task force entered its work with a preconceived notion that Government lending is generally bad, completely ignoring the fact that these agencies, which intimately affect the lives and well-being of millions of Americans, were established to carry out policies formulated after long discussion and investigation of national needs.

COMMISSION NOT OPEN-MINDED ON ISSUES

And the end is not yet in sight. Other task-force groups of the present Hoover Commission have reports and recommendations in production. Hearings staged by the task force on water resources forecast the type of proposals which can be expected to be made public. At hearings held in Portland, Oreg., last June, members of this group apparently had less interest in obtaining the views of the people than they did in telling the people of the Northwest what they should think. As the Oregonian stated in an editorial on July 1, 1954:

> Members of the Hoover Commission task force on water resources had their minds pretty well made up when they came here.

As a result of this entry into the controversial field of policymaking through this report, 5 of the 12 members of the Commission filed statements of dissent. One of the present Commission members, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, recognized the closed-mind attitude and the policy-making role assumed in the present report. In his dissenting statement, Mr. HOLIFIELD said:

> The Congress re-created the Hoover Commission to study the present operation of the executive department and agencies, with a view to better management and economy. I do not believe that the Congress wanted advice from the Commission on public policies of every sort. The Commission has construed its congressional mandate otherwise. This report indicates that the Commission is willing to roam far and wide in the field of public policy.

I agree with Mr. HOLIFIELD's dissent. No good purpose will be served by turning over policymaking functions to a commission which misconstrues its powers of recommendation.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude my brief remarks by placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very succinct and pertinent statement on the so-called power partnership program, which was written last fall by a former distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable Rufus C. Holman. Many Members of the Senate will recall Senator Holman for his notable service in the Senate from 1939 until 1945.

Senator Holman has correctly pointed out that the proposed power partnership of the national administration is adverse to the public and will benefit only private monopolies. The statement of Senator Holman is reprinted from the Weekly Review of Milwaukie, Oreg.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

GUEST EDITORIAL BY FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR RUFUS C. HOLMAN

To the Readers of the Milwaukie Review:

The consumer and user of hydroelectric energy is more interested and concerned in what he pays for it than from whom he buys it; therefore, let us see just why he can get electric energy more cheaply from the publicly owned, operated and transmitted hydroelectric plants than he can from the privately owned power trust plants.

First, the large hydroelectric generating plants are too large for private enterprise and it is in the largest units that electric energy can be generated most economically.

Secondly, it is the rate payer who pays for the construction, maintenance, operation, and transmission of all the hydroelectric plants whether they be publicly or privately owned and operated plants. In each case, the original capital is borrowed but with this difference: The capital debts of the publicly owned plants are gradually reduced and finally extinguished and, therefore, there is finally no item of expense for debt service included in the rate structure, making it possible to eventually reduce the rates for electric power and the cost of it to the consumer and user; whereas in the privately financed and operated hydroelectric plants the capital debts are seldom, or never, reduced and extinguished, but on the contrary often are increased, with the result that a large item for debt service always is calculated in the rate structure. Consequently, the cost of electric light, heat, and power to the consumer is never reduced and may be increased so as to continue to earn profits for large salaries to the private operators, dividends to the owners, and interest to the bankers and moneylenders and their interlocking directorates.

Observe that the Columbia River Interstate Bridge which was built by the public administration never cost the taxpayers a dollar. The tollpayers paid for it in 11 years. Today it is a free bridge, while 50 miles up the river at Hood River is a privately owned bridge operated like the privately owned hydroelectric plants and, likewise, 50 miles down the river at Longview is another privately owned toll bridge operated for private profit. A thousand years from now the public which uses these two privately owned and operated toll bridges will still be paying tolls to cross them.

Obviously it is no advantage to the people for the public to go into partnership by contributing their free bridge to the partnership with the private owners of the two toll bridges.

Similarly, it has not been made crystal clear to intelligent people how it can be of advantage to the people to contribute their great hdyroelectric plants at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and elsewhere in a "partnership" deal with the private power trust (subsidiaries of the Electric Bond and Share Co.).

Such a deal is about as idiotic as it would have been for Henry Ford to have gone into partnership with Al Capone in the automobile business; yet there are those in and out of public service and holding positions of public trust who advocate such a "partnership."

Money has few votes but it causes many birds to sing.

RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
United States Senator, 1939–45.

1954—A FAIRLY PROSPEROUS "DEPRESSION" YEAR

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to various conflicting statements which have been made recently on the question of agricultural prosperity in this country. Many statements have been made based upon assumptions of facts which are not accurate. The fact is, I believe, that agricultural prosperity generally in this country is, if not at an all-time high, at least at the top of the curve.

On March 11, Mr. R. K. Bliss, the head of the extension service at Iowa

State College, delivered a radio address entitled "1954—A Fairly Prosperous 'Depression' Year." Because he analyzes the high level of agricultural income of 1954 and shows the reasons for it, as well as the deficiencies of those who argue that it was not a highly prosperous year, I ask unanimous consent to have this address, consisting of 4 pages, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

1954—A FAIRLY PROSPEROUS DEPRESSION YEAR

(By R. K. Bliss, extension service, Iowa State College)

During the first half of 1954 there were constant predictions of an oncoming depression. Agriculture was said to be in a particularly bad situation. Many economists joined in this gloomy prophecy. It was a forecast based on previous experiences. War had ceased in Korea. Government spending was being sharply reduced. Depressions usually come under such circumstances and following wars. How did it turn out? Let us take a look at farm income in 1954 from the following viewpoints.

1. Farm income in Iowa.
2. Farm income in the United States.
3. General observations.

The Department of Agriculture has just issued preliminary estimates covering cash receipts received by farmers for farm marketings in 1954. This first report may be changed up or down later, but probably not very much.

FARM INCOME IN IOWA

Let us first take a look at farm income in Iowa. Cash receipts from farm marketings received by Iowa farmers in 1954 totaled over $2⅓ billion ($2,347,221,000).

How does this compare with 1953? Let us take a look at that too. Final revised figures on Iowa's cash receipts from farm marketings in 1953 totaled a little less than $2⅖ billion ($2,386,312,000) or $39,091,000 more than in 1954. In view of drought conditions this was not a serious drop in cash receipts.

However, there is more to be included in determining Iowa's production of farm wealth in 1954 than cash receipts. Iowa's Crop and Livestock Reporting Service shows that the numbers of livestock on Iowa farms figured on the basis of grain-consuming units as of January 1, 1955, were 9 percent more than a year earlier on January 1, 1954. Iowa had the highest number of cattle of record (6,279,000 head), 3 percent more than the next highest year. The increase in the livestock inventory on January 1, 1955, over January 1, 1954, was 411,000 cattle; 1,386,000 hogs; and 356,000 chickens. Iowa was down 9,000 head on sheep and lambs and 6,000 head of turkeys.

We will have to wait and see what we receive in cash for this increased inventory of hogs and cattle but as of January 1, 1955, we had a much larger inventory of livestock on farms than on January 1, 1954. If we figure the actual present value of this increased livestock inventory it raises Iowa's agricultural wealth production for 1954 considerably above 1953.

Iowa's grain inventory was also up. On January 1, 1955, as compared with January 1, 1954, Iowa had in all positions an increase of 24½ million bushels of corn, an increase of 9½ million bushels of oats, and an increase of almost 10¾ million bushels of soybeans.

Iowa led all of the States in cash receipts from farm marketings for the first 10 months of 1954. California, which might be called more of an empire than a State, rallied in the last 2 months and topped Iowa over $100 million.

Iowa's 1954 receipts from sales of livestock totaled $1,891,210,000. This was $720,000,000 more than that received by Illinois the next nearest State, and more than twice the amount of livestock sold by Texas.

Iowa's agricultural year of 1954 compares quite favorably with previous years. Now let us take a look at national United States farm income.

FARM INCOME IN THE UNITED STATES

The Department of Agriculture estimates the total cash receipts from farm marketings in the United States at about 30 billion dollars ($29,953,873,000). Farmers net cash income is estimated at $12 billion, down 10 percent from the 1953 figure. This is the figure you will probably read in the papers. It is not the real increase in farm wealth production because it does not include changes in farm inventories.

If inventory changes are included says the Department, the decline in net income from 1953 to 1954 was only a little over 1 percent. Much of the income farmers realized in 1953 was the result of inventory liquidation, that is selling more than they produced. In 1954 farmers sold less than they produced building up their inventories of both crops and livestock. Including inventories along with cash receipts is the accurate way of figuring the total increase in farm wealth production.

The following statement made by the Department is of such interest that I am quoting it in full. "Net income after the adjustment for inventory change which represents the net value of farm output during the year was $12.3 billion in 1954. Adding farm wages of $2.1 billion and $5.7 billion income from nonfarm sources gives $20.1 billion as the total income of the farm population. Although this was 3 percent below 1953, the farm population was down 3½ percent so that total income per capita of the farm population actually rose slightly from 1953 to 1954."

The Department goes on to say that, "Smaller cash receipts from wheat, cotton, dairy products, and eggs accounted for practically all of the $1.5 billion decline in the total." This refers to the decline in gross cash farm marketings in 1954 as compared with 1953. It is of interest to note that the decrease in cash receipts were for wheat and cotton both supported at 90 percent of parity and for dairy products which received 90-percent support part of the year and at all times substantial support. Eggs were not supported. Curtailing acreage to make rigid 90-percent price supports work appears to have reduced farmers' gross income. Perhaps the income might have been still lower with somewhat lower supports. However that may be, high rigid supports does certainly curtail markets, especially foreign markets, and farmers must have markets in order to prosper.

There is another item in this farm income report that will be if interest to Iowa people. Farm products, garden stuff, fruit, meat, eggs, milk, etc., grown and consumed on the farm are figured in as part of the farm income. Farmers consumed about the same amount of home grown food but owing to lower prices principally for dairy products, poultry and eggs this item was reduced $150 million thus reducing total farm income for 1954 by $150 million.

This did not mean that farmers received $150 million less cash. It did not mean a nickle out of farmers' pockets because they grew and consumed the produce on their own farms and there was no buying or selling. It seems rather amusing to decrease farmers' income by $150 million because the food he produced and consumed on his own farm was selling for that much less on the market, but I presume that is about the only way to figure it.

It is something like the story of the economy-minded man who walked to his work rather than pay 10 cents a ride to the street car company. Then the company lowered the price to 5 cents a ride and our economy-minded pedestrian made less money because he could then make only 5 cents a trip by walking while before that he could make 10 cents.

It is rather difficult to exactly determine per capita farm income in the United States because of the increasingly large number of part-time farmers who derive a considerable portion of their income from off the farm work. The Department estimates that United States farmers in 1954 received 5.7 billion dollars from nonfarm sources. Most of it, I suppose, came from off-the-farm employment. This item may be expected to grow.

The number of farms in the United States was 1 percent fewer than in 1953. This raised the average per capita farm income a bit. Farm operators average net income per farm, including the inventory change, was $2,268 in 1954. For the farm operation this was ½ percent below 1953.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The farm income report makes a comparison of per capita farm income with per capita city income. Per capita farm income rose slightly to $918 in 1954. On the other hand, the nonfarm population continued to increase while total income remained about the same. As a result, nonfarm income dropped 3 percent per capita in 1954 to a total of $1,836 per capita. Interestingly enough, the average per capita nonfarm income is just twice the farm income.

Why in this free country should there be such a difference in per capita income between city and country? People do not have to stay on farms if they are dissatisfied with the income. In fact they are not staying on farms. There has been an actual decrease in farm population in the United States of about 10 million people in the past 20 years. Farmers are moving in what might be called a migration to other types of employment.

I believe there are, however, many people who like to live on small tracts of land, work for others part of the time, raise as much of their own food as they can, and on the whole do about as they please. They may enjoy life as much as any of us. Now there are many people and I suppose I am among them that think something ought to be done, as we say, to raise the standards of living of these people.

I don't think this can be done all at once. It is principally a matter of education and incentive. As Dr. Knapp, the agricultural statesman of the South, once said, "When people are in a rut the first thing to do is to make the rut more livable and then they will work themselves out of the rut." He did not feel that there was any short cut to getting people out of ruts. I am of the same opinion. I recall in the early days of extension work a story of an elderly woman who listened to a lecture on home improvement by Miss Isabel Bevier, a pioneer home economist in Illinois. After the lecture someone asked her what she thought about it. Her answer was that "it was all right, but just the same, I'd ruther do what I'd ruther." There are many people like that in this world of ours.

TRANSPORTATION OR MAILING OF OBSCENE MATTER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in reporting favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary S. 599 and S. 600, I wish to point out certain facts.

S. 599, which is a bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate and foreign commerce, and S. 600, a bill to amend title 18 of the

United States Code relating to the mailing of obscene matter, are legislative proposals which, if enacted, would be helpful in checking the interstate traffic in pornography.

This traffic has reached serious proportions. Conservative estimates have placed the nationwide traffic in this filth at 100 to 300 million dollars annually. It is big business, and it depends for a large portion of its profits upon the lunch money and allowances of school children. Curiosity and immaturity of growing boys and girls make them sales targets of the producers and hucksters of pornography.

The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has made certain preliminary studies of the traffic in pornography. These studies have shown that it is chiefly interstate in character and flourishes because of a loophole in the present Federal law. While the Federal statutes now prohibit the interstate shipment of obscene materials by common carrier or through the mails, it is not unlawful to transport pornographic materials by private car or by truck. And it is because of the existence of this loophole that the insidious traffic thrives on an interstate basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator rendered yeoman service in his own special crime investigating committee in connection with that subject, although other matters took precedence.

Would not the question of the interstate traffic be a subject for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, aside from the question of penalties, which come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary? Would not the suppression of this particular traffic come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? The Senator suggests that there is a loophole in the law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know. The bills were introduced and were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, so I assume that committee had jurisdiction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the committee will continue its work in connection with this subject. My only suggestion is that, if it is necessary to change the law regarding interstate traffic, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be found very cooperative in amending the so-called Interstate Commerce Act, to which the Senator refers. I think there is a loophole, which should be examined.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know of the interest of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in this connection, and his interest as a Senator. I think it is a subject which undoubtedly should be considered by both committees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The point I make is that whichever committee does the work, it should be done. We wish to cooperate in every respect.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know that in connection with a great many similar questions there has been a very fine line as between the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and that of the Committee on the Judiciary. We are very fortunate in having the finest type of cooperation in dealing with such questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. These two bills would help to plug the loophole in existing statutes.

The subcommittee, in the course of hearings in various parts of the United States, has heard witnesses tell of the flood of obscene materials which are available to both adults and adolescents. I should like to call attention to statements of some of the witnesses. A lieutenant of the Philadelphia police department testified that his investigations revealed that obscene picture books distributed among Philadelphia schoolchildren were being produced across the state line in South Camden, N. J.

Testimony at the subcommittee hearings in El Paso, Tex., brought out the fact that extensive pornographic materials are being sold across the border in Juarez, Mexico, and are being imported in substantial amounts into the United States.

Testimony at the hearings in Miami, Fla., revealed an extensive traffic in pornographic motion-picture films. Miami police in 1 raid seized 58 rolls of pornographic films in addition to many obscene photographs and books. The dealer who had those pornographic materials had a long record of previous arrests.

In the testimony at the hearings of the subcommittee in San Diego, Calif., an incident was told of a 7-year-old boy who came home with a pornographic book he had obtained by swapping comic books.

The collector of customs at Los Angeles testified that large amounts of pornographic films and pictures came into the port of Los Angeles from abroad.

James A. Fitzpatrick, a member of the New York State Legislature, testified that the most salacious type of material is being mailed to youngsters in schools. He found there were "unsolicited mailings to a list of youngsters in preparatory school, asking if they did not want to buy this type of material."

It was found that one New York dealer purchased names of juvenile comic-book readers and mailed them circulars advertising a number of books which have been declared nonmailable under the postal statutes.

While the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency is continuing its investigation into this insidious traffic in filth designed to sap the moral fiber of our Nation's young people, and while I am sure that further remedial legislative proposals will be forthcoming, I urge that the Senate give favorable consideration to S. 599 and S. 600, as two measures which, if enacted, would go far toward reducing the traffic in pornographic materials.

Mr. President, I now desire to introduce two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR OPERATING RAILROADS AND PERSONNEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, out of order, I introduce for appropriate reference, two bills, one to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards of training and experience for operating personnel of railroads, and for other purposes, and the other to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards of safety for railroad tracks, bridges, and related facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1481. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards of training and experience for operating personnel of railroads, and for other purposes; and

S. 1482. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards of safety for railroad tracks, bridges, and related facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement about a very serious problem which confronts my section of the country and which has relevance to the two bills. It is a matter of tremendous importance, not only to the one section of the country, but, if the strikes continues, to the economy and commerce of the entire Nation.

A few days ago strikes were called by the nonoperating brotherhoods on three railroads which operate in my section, the L. & N., the N. C. & St. L., and the Clinchfield Railroad. These strikes have to some extent paralyzed commerce in this area. I have received a great many telegrams and a great many calls from various companies, businesses, and individuals expressing the hope that the strikes can be settled and that some composition of them can be made. Some of the plants will have to close down if the strikes continue. In addition, many people are being inconvenienced by the lack of transportation. It is indeed an extremely serious matter.

I know that practically all the people, including, I am sure, many connected with railroad management and railroad unions, as well as the public generally, want to see every effort made to bring the strikes to a conclusion as soon as possible. They have been writing and urging those of us in Congress who represent that area to do something about the situation.

I thought I should say something this afternoon about what is causing the strike. I think it is well for us to keep the matter in perspective and to try to find the facts. In that way people will know what the issues are.

There is a great deal of excitement and exaggeration on both side. In order to bring about a meeting of minds, and to have the public clearly understand the issues, I believe it is well to understand some of the basic questions involved in the strikes.

I certainly hope there may be an early settlement of the dispute. We have always been very proud of the fact that for many years there has been on the statute books the railway mediation law, which has always been considered a model of excellence insofar as bringing about a settlement of disputes between railroad employees and railroads is concerned.

Under the Railway Mediation Act, disputes have usually been settled and the railroads have operated almost constantly for many years without having to be closed down by strikes. The Railway Mediation Act requires, first, that demands be made. An effort is made by conferees called by the National Mediation Board to settle the dispute. If that is not successful, the question is finally referred to the President of the United States. The President then appoints an emergency board to make findings and recommendations. Then there is a 30-day cooling off period after the Presidential emergency board has made its finding.

Ordinarily that has served the purpose of avoiding a stoppage of transportation caused by management-labor disputes. The present strike of the operating employees may be the largest one that has taken place since the shopmen's strike in 1922. It is important to consider what is happening in connection with the railway mediation law and to determine whether efforts under it will be sufficient in the days to come.

The chronological happening of events in this case is that on May 22, 1953—and I have talked with a great many people about it—the nonoperating brotherhoods served notice on the carriers, in which they asked for certain improvements in working conditions. They asked for paid vacations, paid holidays, premium pay for work on Sunday, group life insurance, hospital and surgical and medical protection for employees and their families, to be paid for by the railroads, and for liberalized pass privileges.

The railroads countered by asking for certain changes insofar as the rules were concerned, which the railroads felt would be helpful to them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a part of the original proposal presented by the nonoperating brotherhoods in November 1953.

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

On May 22, 1953, the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations served notice pursuant to the Railway Labor Act on the railroads throughout the United States proposing to revise and supplement existing agreements so as to provide:

1. Improved vacations with pay—allowing employees with 1 year of service 5 days of vacation; those with 2 years but less than 5 years, 10 days; those with 5 years but less than 15 years, 15 days; and those with 15 or more years, 20 days. Our proposals also contained improvements in other sections of the vacation agreement dealing with qualifications and service requirements, etc.

2. Seven holidays with pay for all employees, with additional double-time pay for employees required to work on holidays.

3. A health and welfare plan which would allow each employee group life insurance equal to his full-time annual earnings with a minimum of $3,500, and hospital, medical, and surgical benefits for all employees and their dependents, and with the carriers paying all the costs of such insurance and benefits.

4. Premium pay for Sunday service at time and one-half when it is an employee's regular working day, and at double time when it is his day off.

5. A uniform system of free transportation applying to employees of all railway companies, terminals, and joint facilities, the pullman and the express agency and providing specified privileges of free transportation over the lines of their own companies and—under certain conditions—on all other carriers, parties to the agreement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. After an individual effort was made to reach a settlement of the demands and the counterdemands, after the brotherhoods had negotiated with the carriers, and after those efforts had failed, the carriers and the brotherhoods joined in asking for national negotiation, that is, that the railroad labor law be invoked for the purpose of trying to bring about a settlement of the demands.

The first thing that was done was to bring the matter before the National Mediation Board. This was done in October 1953. The strike ballot was taken in November 1953. During the same month the Mediation Board got the parties together—that is, the representatives of the brotherhoods and the representatives of the railroads—for the purpose of trying to work out a compromise and settlement. The Mediation Board continued its efforts until December 1953.

Having failed to mediate the dispute and to settle it, the Board reported that fact to President Eisenhower. They reported that the Board was unable to compromise the differences. Automatically under the law, on December 26 or 27, President Eisenhower appointed the Emergency Board, which was made up of three distinguished men. Mr. Charles L. Loring, the Chairman of the Board, is a former chief justice of the Minnesota Supreme Court. Mr. Adolph E. Wenke, a member of the Emergency Board, was a justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court. Mr. Martin P. Catherwood, another member of the Board, is dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University.

President Eisenhower's commission held hearings beginning in the middle of January 1954. It continued its hearings for several months, until the 7th or 8th of April 1954. I have been advised that the President's Emergency Board held very extensive and lengthy hearings on the demands of the nonoperating brotherhoods and of the railroads.

The board reported to the President on May 15, 1954, and I have a copy of the report.

Neither the railroads nor the brotherhoods were satisfied with the report of the emergency commission. It gave the union members a great deal less than they had requested, and it did not give to the railroads the relief they had requested.

Two or three of the things which the emergency board recommended in connection with an extra week off after a certain number of years' service have been put into effect by all the railroads of the Nation, including the three here involved. One of the recommendations of the board had to do with a health and welfare plan. The board recommended that a health and welfare program be set up in cases where the railroads did not already maintain provision for treatment and hospitalization of employees.

The board recommended that such a program be entered into on the basis of a contribution by the employees of 2 or 3 cents an hour, and a like amount by the companies. The board said:

The charges in connection with such associations are reported for the most part in the range of $4 to $7 a month.

It said the plan could be put into effect by an item that would take 2 or 3 cents from the employees, and that the employer would put up the same amount.

On page 97 of the report of President Eisenhower's Emergency Board, the health and welfare plan is specifically recommended and found to be justified, and it is there set forth. The report was made on May 15, 1954. Under the law, after the report is made, there is still a cooling-off period of 30 days before a strike is called. Thirty days passed after May 15, 1954, and no strike was called.

The railroad companies and the unions got together in the early part of June to see if they could work out agreements which would put into effect the findings and the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board.

I have been advised that agreements were reached on August 21, 1954, with approximately 95 percent of the railroads of the country and covering approximately 95 percent of the employees, and that, as a matter of fact, agreements were reached with all of them except these 3 railroads and 1 or 2 small subsidiary railroads operating in Atlanta. The record shows that some 10 days before the agreement was reached on August 21 the representative of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, who was also representing the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroad, withdrew those railroads from the negotiations. The agreement provides for payment of $3.50 a month by each employee and a similar amount by the railroads into a health and welfare fund for a policy which had been worked out with the Traveler's Life Insurance Co. for medical treatment, hospitalization, and services of that kind.

There were some negotiations in an effort to get the Mediation Board back into the picture.

Finally, the full agreement was consummated on January 18, 1955, with the Traveler's Insurance Co. and with 95 percent of the other railroads.

The three railroads I have mentioned refused to go along with the health and welfare program. That is the issue which is here involved.

Strike notices were given which set forth the provisions in the original strike notice of a year and a half ago.

Of interest in this matter, Mr. President, is the fact that these three railroads are actually owned or controlled by the Atlantic Coast Line. The Louisville & Nashville Railroad owns a controlling interest through the ownership

of 74 percent of the common stock of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroad. The Louisville & Nashville Railroad and the Atlantic Coast Line operate the Clinchfield Railroad by lease.

There has been some suggestion that the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis management might have a settlement worked out with the Clinchfield, and that the Louisville & Nashville ownership and control has been one of the main difficulties in trying to get the recommendations of the President's board agreed to.

On March 9, 2 or 3 days before the strike was to start, an application for an injunction was made in the circuit court in Louisville, Ky., in the chancery court. The matter was heard before the judge of that court. The injunction was requested on the ground that it would be illegal to withhold a part of the compensation of the employees, and that the proposed strike would be an illegal strike. The injunction was asked to prohibit any effort to try to get any part of the wages of the employees withheld. The question was heard by Judge Lampe, and his opinion sets forth, I think, in pretty clear terms what the issues were and what the strike was about involving these three railroads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain pertinent parts of Judge Lampe's opinion printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT, CHANCERY BRANCH, SECOND DIVISION—LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD CO., PLAINTIFF *v.* BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY & STEAMSHIP CLERKS ET AL., DEFENDANT

OPINION

I am aware of the public importance of this litigation. If there was any legal way to avert a threatened labor dispute that might cripple the transportation of this community and in a large measure that of the State and a large segment of the country I would like to find that legal way. I am aware that not only are customers of the railroad injured but also members of the general public and sometimes the employees themselves are injured by the very strikes designed to aid them. It is, therefore, desirable that labor disputes be settled, if that is at all possible, before they culminate in crippling strikes.

Neither the Congress of the United States nor the legislature of Kentucky, however, has vested courts with authority to avert strikes through judicial settlement of labor disputes. Accordingly, I cannot inquire into which of the adversaries to this dispute is in the right or which is in the wrong. I am limited to a determination of one question only. Is the strike about to be called on Monday of next week a legal strike? K. R. S. 366.130 affords employees, collectively and individually the right to engage in a peaceful strike. That statute is merely expressive of the public policy not only of Kentucky but also of the United States.

There is no contention here that any violence is threatened nor were we confronted with any suggestion of a breach of the peace. I must assume that any strike called would be a peaceful one. The question then is when can I enjoin a peaceful strike? In view of the statute just quoted, I feel that I could do that only when such a strike would be clearly against the law. During this trial I had expressed misgivings as to whether I could inquire into the question of whether the threatened strike might violate a Federal law, feeling that I was limited only to determine the question of whether it violated a State law. I had in mind the case of *Garner* v. *Teamsters' Union,* 98 Law Ed. 228, which involved a matter under the N. L. R. B. and held a Federal remedy to be exclusive, thereby depriving State courts of the right to act in the same matter since the Congress had pre-empted the field. That case, however, dealt with an exclusive remedy not with substantive law.

Without available time to consider all other authorities, I accept those offered by the plaintiff to the effect that it is appropriate for me to determine whether this strike is violative of the Federal statute.

The National Railway Labor Act has set up an elaborate method designed to avoid strikes among railway carriers and their employees. First, the parties must negotiate with each other relative to rates of pay, rules and working conditions. When negotiation fails mediation is attempted. Provision is made for the President to appoint an emergency board if other efforts fail. After a report by that Board there is a waiting period of 30 days before actions such as strikes are taken.

It is significant, however, that nowhere does Congress prohibit a strike. The right of labor to strike is not denied. Unions are merely required to comply with the act before resorting to a strike.

All of this procedure under the Railway Act was taken in this case. Appendix A, filed as an exhibit to the complaint, shows the matters that the unions demanded and offered for negotiation in May 1953. It is the unions' contention that the benefits there claimed are still the demands being made by the unions although there is some dispute as to this position.

When the Presidential Emergency Board considered this case it recommended among other things a health and welfare plan, one-half of the cost of which was to be paid by the carrier and one-half of the cost of which was recommended to be deducted from the wages of the employees. Many carriers settled the dispute with the unions on the basis of this recommendation. The Louisville & Nashville, and a few others declined to do so, taking the position that they should not require their employees to contribute compulsorily. They offered what they considered a better voluntary plan.

The Louisville & Nashville and some of their employees intervening herein, now take the position that the Louisville & Nashville was not required to negotiate a health and welfare plan under the Railway Act because such health and welfare does not, they insist, constitute rights of pay, rules, or working conditions. For comparison I am referred to *Inland Steel* v. *NLRB* (170 F. (2d) 247). There, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals pointed out the difference in the NLRB and the National Railway Labor Act.

I do not think it important whether health and welfare is to be considered within rates of pay, rules and working conditions.

If health and welfare does come within these terms, then it was a proper subject for negotiation as was carried through to the final consideration by the Presidential Emergency Board. If it does not come within those terms, I find nothing in the act that requires either the carrier or the unions to go through the elaborate procedure provided in the act as a condition precedent to a strike based on health and welfare demands. There is no expressed congressional intention to deprive the unions of any right to strike for a health and welfare fund. Counsels say that that intention is to be implied.

In view of the Kentucky Statute specifically authorizing employees to engage in peaceful strikes, I do not feel justified in denying them that right by implying into the Federal statute a provision against strikes.

The L. & N. insists that after it rejected the recommendation of the Presidential Emergency Board, there has been no good faith effort on the part of the unions to negotiate, and they offer that position as a violation of the Railway Labor Act, and a basis for denominating this strike an unlawful strike. I reject that theory. The unions were willing to accept the recommendation of the Presidental Emergency Board. It is nowhere shown that they affirmatively withdrew the original demands contained in Appendix A. They were willing to compromise with the L. & N. as they had with the other carriers. I cannot see how it is possible for me to hold that, because they were willing to accept the Emergency Board's recommendation, that they should now be held to have refused in good faith to bargain because thereafter the L. & N. was unwilling to accept that recommendation and insisted upon further bargaining.

It seems to me that at any time after 30 days after the finding of the Presidential Emergency Board, the unions were justified, under the terms of the Railway Labor Act, to pursue any course authorized by that act.

Moreover, the record discloses that as late as 1954, in December, a letter was directed by at least one of the unions to the L. & N. offering to negotiate the May, 1953 demands.

I conclude that the threatened strike does not violate the Railway Labor Act.

The L. & N. insists that the threatened strike is unlawful under the law of Kentucky. Since the recommendation of the Presidential Emergency Board, or at least since the acceptance of the Board's recommendation by most of the other carriers in August 1954, the L. & N. insists that the demands of the unions have been, not as set forth in appendix A requiring the carrier to pay all the costs of the health and welfare fund, but rather the L. & N. accept the compromise recommendation of the Emergency Board, which would require the carrier to deduct one-half of the cost compulsorily from the employees wages. This, the company contends violates section 244 of the Kentucky constitution and K. R. S. 337.060 which prohibits the withholding from employees wages of any sum unless authorized by the employee or a deduction authorized by State or Federal law. If I accept the L. & N. contention as being correct from a factual standpoint, there is merit to its position. The statute does contain this provision. In passing my attention has been called to litigation that was pending in a Federal Court which might have determined whether or not the deduction, which the L. & N. claims is insisted upon, was authorized by Federal law. This litigation was voluntarily dismissed by the L. & N. and others involved therein.

More important to the issue here involved, however, is the inquiry into what originated this labor dispute, upon what questions did the unions vote to strike and what issues were contained in the strike call. No one contends but that the orignal demands were for the company to pay all the health and welfare contribution. When a strike vote was taken in the fall of 1953 it appeared on the ballot that the purpose of the strike was to require the company to pay all of the costs, not to deduct some part thereof from the employees' wages. The strike call issued the day this litigation was initiated, before any issues were argued herein, discloses that, among other things, the purpose of the strike was to require the company to pay all of the costs, not to impose a part of them on the employees.

It may still be, and apparently is, the unions' attitude that they will accept the compromise contained in the Presidential Emergency Board's recommendation. If an agreement along those lines were to be reached it might be that a declaratory judgment action would still be required to de-

termine whether under Kentucky law the deduction would be legal. I do not decide that question now.

I do decide that I cannot hold the unions to be embarked upon an unlawful strike based chiefly upon their willingness to abide by the recommendation of the Presidential Emergency Board, even if those recommendations do require further litigation to determine their validity.

I think the unions' position of being willing to abide by the Presidential Emergency Board's recommendation, but at the same time contending that if the L. & N. is unwilling to abide by it they maintain their right to strike for the original demands, is not an inconsistent position.

Even though the unions have expressed willingness to accept the compromise; even though in their negotiations they have tried to urge upon the L. & N. that compromise in which event at the most they were trying to carry out the spirit of the Railway Labor Act; I do not believe that they have deprived themselves of the right to strike based upon their original demands.

Accordingly, it is therefore ordered by the court that the motion for a temporary restraining order filed by the intervenors is treated as a motion for a temporary injunction and denied; the motion made by the L. & N. for a temporary injunction is also denied. To which the plaintiff and intervenors objected, and they are granted 20 days within which to apply to a judge of the court of appeals to order the issuance of such temporary injunction, if any, as may be proper.

STUART E. LAMPE,
Judge.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the judge held that the injunction should not be issued, and it was not issued. The question was appealed to the court of appeals in Kentucky a day or so following that time, and the court of appeals refused to issue the injunction.

On the Saturday before, or a few days before the strike, an application was made for an injunction to prohibit efforts to get the companies to withhold employees' wages. The application was made in Nashville. An injunction was issued there, and on the following day an injunction was issued at Johnson City, so far as the Clinchfield Railroad employees were concerned.

These matters will be heard in a few days, and the question as to whether the injunction should have been issued will be decided.

I think it is well to point out that the strike was called upon the original strike notice, a copy of which I have already placed in the RECORD, which does not require the company to withhold any amount whatsoever from the employees' salaries. The original demand and strike notice called for the entire amount to be paid by the company. But following the finding by the President's Emergency Board, the brotherhoods agreed to go along with the finding of that Board, and to settle the dispute on the basis that the cost of the health and welfare policy would be borne equally by the employees and the railroads.

Grave questions are raised in connection with the operation of the railway-labor law by reason of the injunctions which have been issued. There is a question whether they are operative in a field which is covered by a Federal law, such as the national-mediation law. There is some doubt about the right of State courts to act in the absence of violence or destruction of property. There is a question as to the right of the employees to strike in the event they have followed all the procedures of the national railway-labor law, and then find their efforts thwarted. There is a question of what kind of action could be brought against the company if the situation were the other way around.

This situation brings up the question of the validity of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which is, of course, applicable only in Federal courts. It would seem to be very difficult to apply the jurisdiction of State courts in a field which has largely been taken over by the national railway-labor law.

Another problem involved in the matter of injunctions is the application of the Louisville & Nashville Railway for an injunction to prohibit the operating unions from striking. A restraining order was issued by a Kentucky judge which, in substance, would require the operating employees to continue to run the trains, even though signalmen and maintenance-of-way men were not on their jobs, thus endangering the lives of train crews and the safety of passengers and the general public. Fortunately, I understand that this restraining order has been withdrawn, and that the problem is not immediately urgent in Kentucky.

My office has received a number of calls from persons who were worried about trains being operated by personnel who are not especially trained for the operating of locomotives or other rolling stock.

So the question arises whether the Interstate Commerce Commission should have jurisdiction in the interest of public safety to provide at least a limited standard of qualifications for persons who operate trains.

When these calls were received by my office, we called the Interstate Commerce Commission, in order to ascertain what the rules are. We were advised that although the Commission required specific inspections of locomotive boilers and airbrakes, it had no jurisdiction whatsoever over the minimum experience which might be required of anyone employed in the train-operating service.

Therefore, one of the bills relates to that problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1481) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. 1) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(23) The Commission may, after hearing, on a complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, establish reasonable regulations with respect to the minimum standards of training, experience, and physical qualification which shall be required of any or all classes of personnel engaged in the operation of railroad trains of carriers by railroad. Any carrier subject to this part which knowingly permits any individual to participate in the operation of any railroad train of such carrier in violation of such regulations shall be liable to a penalty of $100 for each day during which each such violation continues. Such penalty shall accrue to the United States, and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the other bill relates to the question whether, if operating employees should be forced to continue to operate trains, or if inexperienced or less-experienced personnel should operate trains, the safety of passengers and the general public would be protected if there were no standard of safety for the maintenance of railroad tracks, bridges, and related equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that that bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1482) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. 1) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(23) The Commission may, after hearing, on a complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, establish reasonable regulations prescribing the minimum standards of safety which shall be required in the construction, operation and maintenance of rights-of-way, tracks, switches, crossings, bridges, tunnels, signaling devices, and other facilities (except railroad locomotives and cars) necessary for the operation of railroad trains by carriers by railroad. Upon the promulgation of such regulations, the Commission shall establish and maintain an adequate inspection service which shall inspect periodically such facilities of such carriers. Any carrier subject to this part which knowingly violates any such regulation shall be liable to a penalty of $100 for each day during which each such violation continues. Such penalty shall accrue to the United States, and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, after the President's Emergency Board found that there should be a health and welfare plan, a policy with the Travelers Insurance Co. was worked out with all the railroads except these three. The policy will cost about 2 cents an hour for each employee. This is in accordance with the finding of the Presidential Board.

I have been advised that at least one of the railroads in question offered its employees a health and welfare insurance policy in a smaller amount. The policy has a number of limitations and fewer benefits, and is more temporary than the one which has been worked out with all the other railroads. The policy in question was not negotiated and there seemed to have been no effort made to negotiate it or to have it substituted; it was simply prepared by one of the railroads, perhaps others. It would cost the same amount of money, so it would seem that the amount involved is not large, and that the difference between the employees and the railroads is not great.

The railroads apparently are willing to make some payment toward a health and welfare plan or policy, as is evidenced by the fact that, unilaterally, they drafted a policy, which was not, however, negotiated.

It seems to me that, in a matter of this kind, about the best that can be done is to follow the procedure which has been established by law, and to have

mediation and negotiation. If that should fail, then the Presidential Board, composed of disinterested persons, should examine the facts and make a recommendation. So the question involved is in connection with the Presidential Emergency Board's recommendation.

The amount of difference involved between the employees and the railroads is not large. Certainly there should be some way by which the strike can be settled; and the President's Emergency Board should carry substantial weight in the matter.

The public should know that there has been a Board finding, and should know what the finding was. I think it is a matter of public importance to know what steps have been taken to try to put into effect the program which has been effectuated by most of the railroads.

I understand that some of the complaint on the part of the railroads, and perhaps some of the contention with respect to the court orders, is that the railroads are not authorized to make deductions from the wages of employees for the purpose of a welfare program or for any other program. It seems to me that if that is not going to be possible under our labor laws it will be very difficult to have collective bargaining. That was the finding of the judge in Kentucky.

The purpose of collective bargaining is to let some organization speak for all the employees. That is the way the railway labor law operates. Such a provision was a part of the Wagner Act; and it is a part of the Taft-Hartley law, which is now on the books. These laws provide that, under certain circumstances, designated officials, properly selected by an organization, a union, or a brotherhood, shall have the right to speak for the employees. I know of no law in the State of Tennessee which would prevent that from being done.

I also know the history is that back in the depression, in 1932 and 1933, and perhaps part of 1934, when the railroads were met with a situation in which they could not possibly make ends meet, and were having a hard time, and when they were asking that there be reductions in wages, the railroads in question, and perhaps most of the railroads of the Nation, did enter into agreements with their unions, including the nonoperating unions, whereby the unions or brotherhoods authorized those railroads, and others, to deduct 10 percent from the wages of the employees, which amount was kept by the railroads, in order to enable the railroads to have smaller deficits and to continue operations. So that if it was legal at that time, I know of nothing that has changed the law since then.

Furthermore, since then the Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Act have been enacted. The Railway Labor Act has been strengthened by the legislation of 1950. So it is an accepted part of our labor-management policy and program that the duly constituted representatives of unions and brotherhoods on questions of this kind, having to do with wages and working conditions of the employees, have the right to speak for and act for all of the employees.

Mr. President, the strike would do damage to the State of Tennessee, to the railroads, and to industry. Nobody wants that to happen, I am sure the brotherhoods, the employees, would be very happy to have the strike settled. It is hoped that there will be calm and serious consideration of the facts, that there will be no violence, and that there will be an understanding of what the issues involve. I firmly feel that if there is a full appreciation of the issues, the force of public opinion will play an important part in having the parties get together in this very unfortunate labor dispute.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until Friday, March 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Friday, March 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Korea, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

William S. B. Lacy, of Virginia, a Foreign Service reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Atomic Energy Commission

Allen Whitfield, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1955, vice Joseph Campbell, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

Supreme Court of the United States

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

United States Marshal

Lama A. DeMunbrun, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Max A. Wilder, Dadeville.

CALIFORNIA

Keith D. Rice, Blythe.
Julius George Ponchak, Bostonia.
Paul S. Kinsey, Cloverdale.
Winifred B. Thomas, Happy Camp.
Bessie E. Hardy, Inyokern.
Fred J. Figge, Lockeford.
Rocco V. Pernetti, Los Banos.
Robert V. Ely, Lucerne Valley.
Lewis W. Hartwell, Madera.
Bernard P. Piotrowski, Northridge.
Wilma E. Graham, Sloat.
Samuel G. Andersen, Stateline.
Joseph Beeson, Sunnymead.

CONNECTICUT

Roger H. Clark, Cobalt.
Joseph Rocco Ferrigno, Meriden.

GEORGIA

Carl V. Ivey, Lincolnton.
William H. Marshall, Parrott.

ILLINOIS

Vernon L. Wilking, Chebanse.
Carl D. Roadarmel, Cowden.
John Edwin Mickens, Danvers.
Edward J. Hickey, Fox River Grove.
Walter Lueking, Hoffman.
Richard C. Atwood, Hutsonville.
Mary E. Burleigh, Ingleside.
George C. Bryce, Irving.
Vincent E. Cyrier, Manteno.
Cuma F. Holtzclaw, Maunie.
Warren G. Hess, Ontarioville.
Sidney L. Shaw, Petersburg.
Erwin H. Brandt, St. Peter.
Ronald E. Shawger, Sterling
Arnold C. Lapsansky, Witt.
Arthur Hay, Wonder Lake.

INDIANA

Hiram J. Shepherd, Butlerville.
Thomas R. Spence, Galveston.
Clifford K. Smith, Leesburg.
Lloyd D. Spann, Madison.
Don P. Guild, Medaryville.
Joseph S. Dean, Napoleon.
Franklin O. Rarick, Warsaw.
Vera G. Wilkins, Wolflake.

IOWA

Clarence A. Forslund, Harcourt.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frances V. Conley, Manchaug.
Robert L. McCarthy, Warren.

MICHIGAN

Jean N. Carruthers, Bancroft.
Ronald C. Cheever, Britton.
Robert J. Terrell, Byron Center.
Chester V. Muntz, Cass City.
Olga L. Thoms, Centreville.
Wynne Vanderkarr, Corunna.
Donovan E. Springsteen, Fenwick.
Carl F. Riebow, Harrisville.
Wilbur T. McLane, Lake.
Ralph H. Jokipii, Pelkie.
Robert J. McIntosh, Port Huron.
Myrtle E. Kennedy, Topinabee.

MINNESOTA

Raymond O. Johnson, Cloquet.
Dale A. Lahti, Kelly Lake.

MISSISSIPPI

Philip E. Swayze, Benton.
Dora F. Lynd, Escatawpa.
Joseph B. Pickett, Pope.
Carroll M. Butler, Raleigh.
Elizabeth H. Branch, Shelby.
Roy A. Schmidt, Sontag.

NEBRASKA

Bernard J. Holen, Bertrand.
Lois J. Larson, Macy.
Anton F. Fisher, Weston.

NEVADA

Norma N. Bianchini, Beowawe.

NEW JERSEY

J. Ward Johnson, Belford.
Lyman H. Graham, Bradley Beach.
Joseph J. Kelly, Coytesville.
George E. Cusick, Demarest.
Anna P. MaGill, Lafayette.
Dorothy L. Curley, Lyons.
Ruth E. Alt, Morganville.
Edna I. McTamney, Neshanic Station.
Henry J. Formon, Ridgefield.
Amelia S. Applegate, South River.
Philip N. Mazziotta, Towaco.

NEW YORK

W. Arthur Lewis, Fishers.
Florence Thompson, Harriman.
Donald M. Baker, Moriah.
Lloyd A. Carter, Saranac.
Berta L. Wixom, Trumansburg.
Donald M. Tobey, Victor.
John A. Harrington, West Oneonta.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bernard E. O'Connor, Bainbridge.
Ward O. Sharpe, Murrysville.
Rita P. Ritchie, Prospect.
James M. Dougherty, Ralston.
Arthur Mosteller, Shawnee on Delaware.
Marie H. McDannell, Spartansburg.
Jane E. McKenry, West Bridgewater.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lucille G. Heyward, Bluffton.
Lee M. Blanchett, Summerville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ranald A. Bishop, Hurley.

TEXAS

Edward A. Buffington, Anderson.
Bernice F. Hines, Diboll.
Hal E. Hanson, Dickinson.
Martin B. Glasscock, La Feria.
Samuel S. Williams, Marshall.
Howard G. Turner, Orange.
Odie K. Gaylor, Pampa.
Claud M. Erwin, Rocksprings.
Oscar C. Hope, Jr., Scottsville.
Donald H. Smith, Spearman.
Miller E. Herrington, Whitney.
Esta L. Matson, Zephyr.

UTAH

Byron L. Huish, Magna.

VIRGINIA

Robert K. Drumwright, Jr., Fork Union.

WISCONSIN

Archie W. Christman, Darien.
Wendell G. Williams, Elcho.
Floyd A. Fralick, Glen Haven.
Arnold L. Peters, Marinette.
DeWayne W. Jensen, Minong.
Ernest M. Iverson, Williams Bay.

WYOMING

Allen L. Swan, Douglas.
Robert A. Lowham, Evanston.
Walter S. Brown, Jr., Pine Bluffs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose thoughts concerning us are always those of love and peace, we rejoice that daily we are living under the canopy and shelter of Thy divine grace.

Grant that in this moment of quietness our minds and hearts may be filled with the spirit of penitence and humility, of gladness and gratitude, of faith and hope.

Help us to give ourselves unreservedly to the guidance of Thy Spirit and may every thought of our minds be brought into a glad obedience to the way of our Master.

May we be one in our longings and search to know Thy will for our generation and one in our aspirations and endeavors to obey Thy will with courage and faithfulness.

Inspire our character and conduct with the holiness and heroism, the consecration and dedication of our blessed Lord, in whose name we pray and bring our petitions. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4259. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 92) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 91, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 117) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 5, 1955, the expenses of the investigations and studies conducted pursuant to House Resolution 105, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING NEED FOR RENEWAL OF OATH OF OFFICE UPON CHANGE OF STATUS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person who, upon appointment as an employee of the Senate, has subscribed or hereafter subscribes to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, shall be required to renew such oath so long as the service of such person as an employee of the Senate is continuous.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, following the word "Senate", insert "or House of Representatives."

Line 8, following the word "Senate", insert "or House of Representatives."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "An act to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate or House of Representatives."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the author of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is it? How Does it Function?", as set out in House Document No. 465, 79th Congress, and subsequent editions thereof, revise the same, bring it up to date, and that it be printed as a public document.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a House document, and there shall be printed 300,000 additional copies, of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 266,150 for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate Document Room; and 6,000 for the House Document Room.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF PRAYER ROOM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is hereby authorized and directed to prepare a report on the origin, establishment, furnishing, and decoration of the Prayer

Room established by House Concurrent Resolution 60 of the 83d Congress for use of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Such report shall be printed as a House document with illustrations, in accordance with regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed 100 copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress.

SEC. 3. As used in this resolution, the term "Member of Congress" includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of, and a Delegate to, the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 2, strike out "Legislative Reference Service" and insert "Architect."

Line 3, strike out "Library of Congress" and insert "Capitol."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 91), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the said committee during the 83d Congress, 2d session, on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out the word "one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 93), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is ordered to be reprinted 50,000 copies of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress, entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," by Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of 90 days, after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 2, strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 20,000 additional copies of parts 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26 of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 177) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the hearings entitled "Volume I of the Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1956," held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICAL OR MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT FOR USE BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or merchanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives," approved March 25, 1953 (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (c)), is amended by striking out "not more than two of each."

SEC. 2. The first section of such joint resolution is further amended by adding after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Except in case of electric typewriters, not more than two of each of the general types of equipment described in subsection (c) may be furnished under this joint resolution for use in the office of a Member, officer, or committee."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does this bill provide for?

Mr. BURLESON. The bill raises the ceiling on a $10,000 limitation that was imposed on the Fine Arts Commission for their activities. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] introduced this bill. I would be glad if he would answer further questions as to the specific reason why. I think it is common knowledge that heretofore the limitation has not been observed and that it is not practical. For that reason the bill was introduced.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman from New Jersey: What is the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is a statutory body created under the law in 1910 to see to the aesthetic development of the city of Washington in its growth. They make recommendations with regard to the design of buildings, and so on.

Mr. GROSS. Does this call for an increased appropriation?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It raises the ceiling upon the appropriation which was set by law in 1910 of $10,000. The fact is that by ultra vires act over the years the appropriation committees have in fact been giving them more than $10,000. This merely makes legal something which has been taking place for some time.

May I point out to the gentleman that in two instances, under Public Law 231 of the 71st Congress and Public Law 808 of the 81st Congress the duties of the Fine Arts Commission have been expanded. That has also been the case by 2 or 3 Executive orders.

Mr. GROSS. Expanded in what way?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Public Law 231 of the 71st Congress is an act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas in the National Capital. The other one is to do the same thing for the private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area.

Mr. GROSS. What is the total expenditure under this proposal?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The total expenditure under this proposal is not specifically set forth. They will go before the appropriate committee and ask for their bare needs, which I will hazard a guess and say will be in the vicinity of $25,000 instead of the present $10,000.

Mr. GROSS. Are these commissioners paid?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They are not paid except on a per diem and actual expense basis. Some of them must travel and it has become increasingly difficult for them to do so under the present appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. How much are they paid? What is the per diem allowance?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They do not receive per diem allowance. Only their actual traveling expenses.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the parliamentary situation at the present time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the bill that they have been talking about?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And it is not a privileged matter?

The SPEAKER. It is not a privileged matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on House Resolution 170 and House Resolution 171.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are minority views to be filed in connection with these resolutions?

Mr. VINSON. I imagine there will be a minority report.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman incorporate that in his request in the event that minority views are to be filed?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on House Resolution 170 and House Resolution 171 and that the same privilege be granted for the filing of minority views.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, these two resolutions do not deal with universal compulsory conscription, do they?

Mr. VINSON. No; these resolutions deal with the question of the disposal program of synthetic rubber. I may at this time announce that if the reports are filed tomorrow, I have agreed with the leadership to call them up on next Tuesday morning.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us whether Members will have an opportunity to discuss the bills when they come in and vote on them?

Mr. VINSON. Under the rule, they have 10 hours of general debate. I will try to reach an agreement with the authors of the resolutions for a reasonable time, thus assuring the distinguished gentleman that he will have an opportunity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You say I will have an opportunity?

Mr. VINSON. I hope so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That will be a fine procedure. You know we have not had it before.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

MARCH 16, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES A. HALEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 178) electing JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida, to the standing committee of the House on Veterans' Affairs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF CORPORATE AND EXCISE TAX RATES AND $20 CREDIT FOR EACH PERSONAL EXEMPTION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] know at this time how long it will probably take to reach an agreement in conference?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly I am not able to advise the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on that point.

Mr. MARTIN. I was afraid he might not. Further, when the committee does report, those of us who believe in the right of the other party to vote their views will have that opportunity when the conference report is submitted? That is a fact, is it not?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly the rules of the House will be followed. There is no question about that.

Mr. MARTIN. I expect that, too. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to sending this bill to conference because I realize that this is very important legislation and that the country is looking forward to it and it must be passed before April 1. Otherwise it would be a very serious blow to the finances of the country. So I am quite sure the conferees will be able to reach an agreement before April 1. If there is no agreement, I am sure those who support the Senate will have an opportunity to vote before the date of expiration of the taxes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I feel I should probably point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means will concur with me in this statement, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] knows, the Committee on Ways and Means has a very important hearing scheduled for 10 o'clock tomorrow morning on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury that certain provisions of the tax bill passed last year be immediately repealed. As the gentleman knows, notice was issued pursuant to an agreement of the Committee on Ways and Means last Monday, that those public hearings would be held tomorrow. I am advised by the clerk of the committee that there are some 18 or 20 witnesses requesting to be heard. I assume we will probably conduct hearings tomorrow and the next day to hear all those witnesses. Of course, the committee will be busy during that time. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] will concur with me in that statement.

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS.

DAMAGE FROM FLOODS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Floods are always tragic. They result in damage and they result in loss of life, but it is interesting to us who want to see the work of reducing the damage from floods to continue to read a very complete report issued by the Corps of Army Engineers as of March 15, covering the flood situation in the Ohio Valley as of this time. While the flood damage is heavy and there is loss of life in the Ohio Valley, the flood-control facilities are operating effectively and are reducing the damage and the loss of life. A great program for making the valley safe seems to be paying dividends.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed at this point in the RECORD that it may be available to the Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report referred to follows:

SUMMARY OF OHIO RIVER FLOOD OF MARCH 1955

(By Col. J. L. Person, division engineer, Ohio River Division, Corps of Engineers, Cincinnati, Ohio)

Twice within 5 months in late 1954 and early 1955, the Ohio River tested the Corps of Engineers' plan for flood control in the Ohio Valley, and twice the value of sound, comprehensive planning was proved, even though the plan has only partially been translated into protective construction.

Damages aggregating close to $218 million were prevented: Approximately $149 million by works in the upper river in October, when Hurricane Hazel dropped enough water in the upper watershed to have otherwise produced the third highest flood of record at Pittsburgh and Wheeling, and the remaining $69 million in March of this year, $50 million of the latter in the stretch of river from below Wheeling, W. Va., to Maysville, Ky., including tributaries.

Actually the latter flood resulted from three distinct storms: One on February 21–22; another during the period February 26 to March 1, and the last during the period from March 3 to March 6.

During the first period rains were moderately heavy on northern and southern tributaries of the Ohio in Ohio, eastern Kentucky, and West Virginia. The second storm was marked by light precipitation on the northern tributaries in Ohio, and heavy rainfall on southern tributaries in West Virginia.

The third storm brought moderately heavy rain along the northern tributaries in Ohio and southeastern Pennsylvania, and heavy precipitation along southern branches in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky.

The net result would have been the third highest flood of record in the Huntington, W. Va., area, had it not been for the fortunate fact that the rains fell in areas where effective control was possible from completed Corps of Engineers reservoirs. Had heavier portions of the same rains fallen within areas not yet protected, much higher stream stages would have resulted, with flood loss mounting considerably more than the preliminary estimate of $15½ million.

Just as operation of 10 Pittsburgh area reservoirs knocked about 9 feet from crests in the Pittsburgh-Wheeling reach in October, a total of 28 completed reservoirs—14 in the Muskingum Valley of Ohio plus 4 others in the Huntington district and the 10 near Pittsburgh—effected crest reductions of from 3½ to 7 feet along a 600-mile stretch of the Ohio. Typical were these:

Pittsburgh, Pa., 3.4 feet; St. Marys, W. Va., 3.5 feet; Marietta, Ohio, at the mouth of the Muskingum, 4.1 feet; Parkersburg, W. Va., 3.5 feet; Pomeroy, Ohio, 6.5 feet; Point Pleasant, W. Va., 6.6 feet; Huntington, 6.3 feet; Ashland, Ky., 7 feet; Portsmouth, Ohio, 6 feet; Maysville, Ky., 5.6 feet; Cincinnati, 5 feet; Louisville, Ky., 3.5 feet.

Expressed another way: Had it not been for operation of the reservoirs, the turgid Ohio would have reached a crest at Huntington only 6 inches lower than the 66-foot stage of 1913, a flood second only to the record onslaught of 1937 when the river reached 69.4 feet. As it was, the stream crested at 59.5 feet against flood stage of 50 feet.

At Cincinnati, the river reached 61 feet, 9 feet above flood stage, and full 19 feet below the record 80-foot stage recorded in 1937. But, again, had it not been for reservoir control, the Ohio would have stopped only a bare 2½ inches below the 66.2-foot top reached in 1883, a flood listed as the fifth highest disaster of record in the valley. The Ohio remained above flood stage for 11 days at Cincinnati, edging above 52 feet on March 2, and slipping below at dusk on March 13.

The combination of reservoir control and protection afforded by Corps of Engineers local protective works created a situation unique in flood annals in the Ohio Valley. The major portion of such cities and towns as Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, Huntington and Ceredo-Kenova, W. Va., Ironton and Portsmouth-New Boston, and Mill Creek Valley section of Cincinnati, Ohio; Ashland, Maysville, Newport, Covington, Louisville and Paducah, Ky., Lawrenceburg, Jeffersonville, New Albany and Evansville, Ind., and Cairo, Ill., remained high and dry behind levees or flood walls. Flood loss was held to an astonishing minimum, considering the widespread sweep of water.

Preliminary Corps of Engineers figures with some of the tributaries not yet accounted for, placed property loss at about $15½ million, of which $13 million was recorded in that portion of the Valley above Lawrenceburg, Ind., a small community important as a distillery center located some 23 miles west of Cincinnati, and 493 miles below Pittsburgh. The remainder was listed for the 488 miles of the Middle and Lower Ohio extending from Lawrenceburg to Cairo, Ill., where the Ohio joins the Mississippi—an area where flood heights on the Ohio fell off rather rapidly.

The flood caused considerable suffering and inconveniece to thousands of lowland dwellers—as all floods do. But paralleling the low record of property loss is the fact that throughout the thousand-mile valley, the Red Cross and other relief agencies evacuated fewer than 3,500 persons from their homes, and the Corps of Engineers was called upon to perform only one emergency mission—and that of minor nature—at Maysville, Ky., where a pump was hastily installed to assist partially completed flood wall facilities. Three drownings have occurred during the current flood.

Corps of Engineers flood walls and levees—including 43 of the 132 authorized local protection projects which have been put into operation—performed "as expected." Not a single sandbag was filled, much less wet.

The record of damage prevented is all the more remarkable because the Ohio Valley's flood control plan has been authorized only since 1938 when Congress acted to prevent recurrence of such widespread disasters as the 1937 flood and its record of property loss of more than $400 million. Only 33 of the 80 reservoirs authorized by the act of 1938 have been completed, along with the 43 local protection works.

The threat of major disaster still hangs over the valley and will continue to hang until such time as the plan is completed. This, of course, will depend upon the rate at which funds are appropriated by the Congress.

The current estimated total Federal cost of the congressionally authorized program for the Ohio River Valley (including all authorized navigation, flood-control and multiple-purpose projects) is $2,783 million.

Funds made available to date have permitted the overall project to be advanced to 29-percent completion.

PAMPHLET "THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES"

Mr. IKARD. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 176, which provides for the publication of 250,000 copies of a pamphlet entitled "The House of Representatives," which I have prepared. It deals with the history, traditions, and great and interesting personalities who have served in this great, distinguished legislative body. The pamphlet also includes descriptive matter concerning the Capitol Building and Capital City of the United States.

I hope and feel that this pamphlet will be instructive and beneficial and will tell the story of the great contribution that the House of Representatives has made toward free government and the freedom of America generally.

House Resolution 176 is as follows:

Resolved, That the pamphlet entitled "The House of Representatives," which sets forth the history and functions of the House of Representatives, shall be printed as a House document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 250,000 additional copies of such House document for the use of the House of Representatives.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon notwithstanding the House may be in recess or in session.

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

There was no objection.

HOSPITAL NEEDS OF VETERANS OF FLORIDA

Mr. MATTHEWS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of Congress have read with a great deal of interest the task force report of the Hoover Commission on Federal medical services, which has been released with a dateline of February 1955.

On page 117 of the report it is recommended that the Veterans' Administration close and dispose by sale or otherwise any hospital which in its judgment can no longer be operated effectively or economically. Then, in its appendix 12 on page 135 of the report, the task force recommended the Lake City, Fla., hospital as 1 of 19 which, in its words, "should be closed because it has such a small bed capacity, is so poorly located, or has such a low rate of bed utilization that its continued operation is uneconomic and ineffective." I should like to point out some of the facts concerning the Lake City, Fla., veterans' hospital. This splendid institution has never had a chance to perform effectively until recently because its buildings are half a century old, and it has been for years in a most dilapidated condition. Its main buildings were used by the University of Florida over 50 years ago. However, the Veterans' Administration, recognizing the need of a modern renovation program, obtained from Congress an item of over $4 million to complete this modern renovation program, which will be completed probably about June of this year. Now this hospital at Lake City, Fla., will be modern in every respect and will, for the first time in its history, have the facilities to operate effectively. I am very much concerned that the task force seemingly did not take this modernization program into consideration at all when it made its recommendation. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever but that the Veterans' Administration will insist on keeping this veterans' hospital at Lake City, which serves not only the northern part of Florida, but the southern portion of Georgia and other sister States, and will in the future continue the needed expansion of this facility.

The task force pointed out the great problem of taking care of our veterans who have neuropsychiatric problems. I am glad they pinpointed that great problem, because for 2 years now I have been pointing out to the Congress the tremendous problem we have in caring for our veterans with neuropsychiatric disorders in the State of Florida. I know that any objective study of the veteran's hospital program in Florida will show how far behind our great State lags in providing the hospital beds for the veteran population. At the present time in Florida we have only 1,350 general hospital beds, and 116 NP beds to take care of a veteran population which is estimated now at 436,000. This means that the ratio of veterans per VA hospital bed in the United States as a whole is 185 to 1, whereas the ratio of veterans per VA hospital bed in the State of Florida is 332 to 1. The ratio of veterans per NP bed in the United States as a whole is 450 to 1, while in Florida it is approximately 3,750 to 1. We had as of February 1, 362 of our veterans in the Florida State mental hospital who were suffering from non-service-connected neuropsychiatric problems, and there were 39 in the county jails throughout the State because there were no facilities for them. I am confident that there are hundreds of other veterans in Florida with mental disorders who have never sought admittance into a VA hospital because they know there are no bed facilities, and are now dependent on the mercy of friends, or they are in the custody of their loved ones who do not have the facilities to take care of them properly.

The great House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which does such a splendid job in evaluating the needs of our veterans and fighting for a square deal for them, has looked thoroughly into this situation of a neuropsychiatric hospital for Florida.

On March 1 the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs granted the Florida Delegation, and other interested citizens from Florida a hearing on my bill, H. R. 1820, which proposes the establishment of a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville, Fla., the home of the University of Florida, and the site of the State of Florida's medical school which will admit its first class in September of 1956. This location is ideal for a neuropsychiatric hospital because it will be in the area of a great medical center, and in a central location in Florida.

Florida at the present time has nearly 900 veterans hospitalized outside the State. We are faced with a great disadvantage in geography as far as veterans' hospitals are concerned because our veterans can go only from south to north. We are surrounded on three sides by water. I am sure we can all realize the great problems and expense of appropriate mental treatment for veterans who have to go in some cases literally a thousand miles or more away from home for treatment. Florida needs this neuropsychiatric hospital, and I sincerely hope the hospital subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs can visit Gainesville, Fla., in the immediate future to get any information needed to evaluate this great problem of the neuropsychiatric veterans in Florida.

THE SOCIETY OF THE 28TH DIVISION

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced a bill providing for the incorporation of the Society of the 28th Division. I invite the particular attention of any of my colleagues who might be veterans of this great fighting unit and will certainly welcome them as cosponsors.

REGULATION OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I had occasion to comment upon the report issued by the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, which recommended exemption from regulation of the so-called independent producers of natural gas, and recommended, also, that fair field value be used as the basis for the rate regulation of natural-gas companies, rather than actual legitimate cost. Inasmuch as the 8-man committee consisted of 7 members of the President's Cabinet and the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization as chairman, it seemed certain that the report reflected the views of the Eisenhower administration. I said at that time:

> The report continues the administration's long record of flouting the interests of the consumers. If its recommendations are adopted, consumers will pay hundreds of millions of extra dollars into the treasuries of the big oil and gas companies.

Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the White House is hedging on accepting the report of the committee. Word issues from other assistants to the President that the President may not accept the viewpoint of his committee.

I have just been furnished with a letter written on March 4, 1955, by Gerald D. Morgan, special counsel to the President, to Joseph F. Grossman, special assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, which is as follows:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, March 4, 1955.*
>
> Mr. JOSEPH GROSSMAN,
> *Special Assistant Corporation Counsel,*
> *City of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.*
>
> DEAR MR. GROSSMAN: The President asked me to reply to your letter of March 2, enclosing the copy of the resolution of the city council of Chicago, concerning possible legislation dealing with jurisdiction to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead.
>
> As you know, some time ago the President designated several members of the Cabinet to serve as an advisory group on energy-resources problems. That group issued a report last Saturday, and among its recommendations was one dealing with the subject matter in which you expressed an interest.
>
> These recommendations do not, however, represent recommendations of the President. They are merely recommendations of the advisory group to the President.
>
> The President expects to give thorough consideration to these recommendations with a view to achieving the maximum protection of the interests of consumers. You may be sure that the President will give the views expressed in the resolution and your letter careful consideration.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> GERALD D. MORGAN,
> *Special Counsel to the President.*

Mr. Speaker, the White House is now in the very adroit position of being on both sides of this very controversial issue and therefore, on neither side. The

country wants to know what stand the President intends to take. Inasmuch as time is fleeting and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has scheduled hearings on legislation dealing with this very important matter on March 22, I am impelled to ask: "Mr. President, won't you please make up your mind as to whether or not you intend to approve the report of your Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy?"

MONOPOLY IN RUBBER BAD FOR AMERICA—QUESTION TO BE DECIDED IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, if present plans are carried out, a major national problem will be decided by the House. It involves the disposal of the synthetic rubber plants to big rubber and oil companies in a way that I believe will be ruinous to the public interest.

This question affects everyone in the United States. It involves the price of automobile tires, the protection of small business against unfair and destructive competition, and the creation of an iron-clad rubber monopoly.

The following letter I have sent to Chairman VINSON is self-explanatory:

MARCH 16, 1955.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I was gratified that your committee had Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust, before the Armed Services Committee on March 15 and put a number of questions to him concerning the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission's plan for selling the Government-owned synthetic rubber industry to a few rubber, oil, and chemical corporations. As you know, I feel very strongly that the monopoly aspects of this plan and its provisions purporting to provide some protection to small rubber fabricators have not been adequately explored, and that the Attorney General's letter of January 17, included in the Commission's report to Congress, leaves unanswered a number of questions which should be answered before the House has to make a decision on this matter.

As to the military and national security aspects of the Disposal Commission's plan, I have complete confidence that your committee has explored and considered the matter expertly and I have no doubt that you have found the national security fully protected in this plan. As I stated to your committee on March 11, however, I feel that there is a great deal more at stake in this plan than the national security; the plan raises complex questions concerning the welfare of our domestic economy, and concerning the future of small business particularly. I do not believe moreover, that there has to be a choice between protecting our national security and protecting our domestic economy against monopoly control of a vital industry and destruction of small business. On the contrary, I believe that the two objectives are completely compatible. In fact, I believe that both of these objectives would be reinforced under a plan which effectively meets both objectives, for long experience has proved over and over again that a monopolized industry tends to retard expansion of capacity and tends to inhibit technical innovations and progress.

Consequently, while I am satisfied with the national security aspects of the Disposal Commission's plan, I am as yet far from satisfied with the monopoly and small-business aspects of the plan and with the adequacy of the information which either the Attorney General or Judge Barnes has given on these aspects of the plan. I have had prepared, therefore, the attached list of questions, which I believe should be put to Judge Barnes and which I believe must be answered, before Congress can make an informed decision on the question of whether it should disapprove the Disposal Commission's plan.

Since the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorney General, Judge Barnes, have a statutory responsibility for advising Congress with reference to the question, whether the Disposal Commission's plan meets the criteria set out in the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (Public Law 205, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) concerning the establishment of a free, competitive, synthetic-rubber industry and concerning the plan which best protects small business, I hope that you may see fit to put these questions to Judge Barnes and have his answers made available to the House before we take up the question of this disposal plan next week.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

The questions for the Honorable Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust, are as follows:

Judge Barnes, I would like to invite your comments on one broad, general question; then I have a few questions on specific points I would like to get cleared up.

The general question relates to the second paragraph of the Attorney General's letter of January 17. It reads as follows:

"This is to advise you that on the basis of the information furnished to me by the Commission I do not view the proposed dispositions as being in violation of the antitrust laws. I express no opinion, however, concerning the legality of any programs or activities in which the proposed purchasers may engage in the utilization of these properties, nor as to any matters other than whether or not the proposed dispositions violate the antitrust laws."

Now that statement contains two qualifications which I would like for you to examine. First, it contains the phrase "on the basis of the information furnished to me by the Commission" and says nothing about other information which the Department of Justice may have or could reasonably have gotten from other sources. Second, if I read the remainder of the statement correctly it says simply this: The Attorney General expresses the opinion that the proposed disposition of these plants, taken alone and quite apart from any other facts which he may or may not know to exist, will not violate the antitrust laws; but the Attorney General expressly reserves the opinion whether or not there would be a violation of the antitrust laws, taking account of the whole factual situation, the moment these plants are transferred.

Now, as I understand the antitrust laws, you frequently have situations where a particular competitive arrangement taken alone, out of context of the whole factual situation, is not violative of any laws, but when you add this competitive arrangement to the whole factual situation you have an unreasonable restraint of trade. Now, I am not talking about secret agreements or conspiracies or understandings among these proposed purchasers. I realize that there could be secret agreements, which you might not know about and might never know about even though you investigated diligently, so I am not talking about agreements or understandings which you may not know about, but this is the question I want to get clarified: Quite apart from any agreement which you do not know about, has the Department of Justice investigated and considered the whole factual situation insofar as it could reasonably ascertain the facts and satisfied itself that there will not be an unreasonable restraint of trade or other violation of the antitrust laws the moment these plants are transferred?

2. Now, the rest of my general question pertains to the analogy you have here with the Supreme Court's decision in the Columbia Steel case. (*U. S.* v. *Columbia Steel Co. et al.* (334 U. S. 495, decided June 7, 1948).) The theory of the United States in bringing that suit was that the acquisition of Consolidated constituted an illegal restraint of interstate commerce because all manufacturers except United States Steel would be excluded from the business of supplying Consolidated's requirements of rolled steel products, and because competition then existing between Consolidated and United States Steel would be eliminated.

In addition, the Government alleged that the acquisition of Consolidated, viewed in the light of the previous series of acquisitions by United States Steel, constituted on attempt to monopolize the production and sale of fabricated steel products in the Consolidated market. That last aspect of the case was vigorously contested. The defense was predicated in a substantial way upon the fact that the United States Government had in 1947 sold to the United States Steel Corp. a large plant at Geneva, Utah, and that in that connection the Attorney General had concluded "that the proposed sale, as such, did not violate the antitrust laws."

You will also remember in that connection that the Supreme Court in disposing of that aspect of the case stated: "To show that specific intent, the Government recites the long history of acquisitions of United States Steel, and argues that the present acquisition when viewed in the light of that history demonstrates the existence of a specific intent to monopolize. * * * We look not only to those acquisitions, however, but also to the latest acquisition—the Government-owned plant at Geneva. We think that latest acquisition is of significance in ascertaining the intent of United States Steel in acquiring Consolidated." The Court then proceeded to dismiss the suit by a vote of 5 to 4.

Then the court pointed out that when approval was given to the sale of the Geneva plant to United States Steel, the Government had reason to know that if United States Steel acquired the Geneva plant it would for "normal business purposes" either acquire or build finishing facilities to assure itself a market for the unfinished steel produced at the Geneva plant, and the Government made no objection. Now this raises a question. First, you are approving the sale of 31.8 percent of the butadiene capacity to one partnership company—the partnership being made up of 2 oil companies and 2 rubber companies.

Now, permit me to ask you this: If, in the future, you decided to proceed against one of the rubber companies under the Clayton Antitrust Act or the Sherman Act because of any proposal on their part to acquire smaller companies in order to balance their rubber capacity with their butadiene capacity, or to balance their butadiene capacity with their rubber capacity, or to balance

their rubber fabricating capacity with their rubber capacity, how could you distinguish, as a matter of law, such a situation from the situation disposed of by the Supreme Court in the Columbia Steel case and what different results could you expect to secure?

Now for my more specific questions:

3. It has been pointed out that according to this disposal plan, no one company will have more than 18.8 percent of the GR-S capacity. On the other hand, the disposal plan calls for one partnership company, to have 31.8 percent of the butadiene capacity. The partnership company is made up of Gulf, Texas, U. S. Rubber, and Goodrich. These four companies, together, will have 29.1 percent of the GR-S capacity. Since these four companies will be a partnership in 31.8 percent of the butadiene capacity, would you see any substantial difference insofar as practical competition is concerned, if they formed a single partnership company to handle their 29.1 percent of the GR-S capacity?

4. I would like to ask you about the license agreements. The second paragraph of the Commission's statement on this subject (p. 31) indicates that the Commission has made available to prospective purchasers the patent agreements to which the Government is a party and that it has taken actions to assist prospective purchasers to obtain licenses to use patents to which the Government was not a party. I quote from the Commission report as follows: "The patent agreements to which the Government was a party and the actions subsequently taken in this field by the Commission assure that adequate rights to patents and technical information are available to plant purchasers." Beyond this however, the Commission has not told Congress what it has done; we don't know what these actions were, what the terms and conditions of the license agreements are, and I wonder if the Department has examined all of these license agreements and satisfied itself that none of the royalties are unreasonable and that there is nothing else in them which will unreasonably restrain competition.

5. What has been the Department's usual position with reference to patent pooling where the pool was restricted to members and not freely open to all newcomers?

6. The Attorney General's report has something to say about the patents and agreements covering butyl rubber, but it seems to be silent on this subject as regards the more important classes of rubber and feed stocks. Can you tell me where the provisions are in the contracts with the proposed purchasers of the rubber facilities, or elsewhere, which assure that the patent pool which will now be set up among the proposed purchasers will be open to the other companies that might wish to enter some phase of the synthetic-rubber business in the future?

7. The Commission's report contains this sentence: "* * * in the appendix to each contract of sale, the Commission has agreed that, to the extent of the Government's powers under these agreements, it will assist purchasers in obtaining necessary rights," speaking of patent rights, of course. Can you tell us whether or not the Government has sufficient powers under these agreements that it could, if it cared to do so, assure any and all possible purchasers the right to use all product and process patents now necessary for successful operation of the butadiene and GR-S rubber plants.

8. In view of the fact that when the Government-owned aluminum plants were sold, the Department of Justice insisted upon having, as a condition of the sale, a provision making licensing of patents at reasonable royalties compulsory, I am wondering why the Department has not insisted upon such a provision in the case of these rubber facilities.

9. The assurances that we have been offered that small rubber fabricators will have access to adequate supplies of rubber at fair prices rest in large part on the premise that the production of Shell on the west coast will all be put on the open market, since Shell is not a rubber fabricator. In this connection the Attorney General's report (p. 34) is to the effect that since the major tire companies will have copolymer plants on the gulf coast, they will supply their west coast tire plants from these. The Attorney General's report does not make it clear however, how much surplus production these tire companies will have at their gulf coast plants after supplying the requirements of their more eastern markets, or why these major tire companies took 90 percent of the production of Shell's west coast plant in 1954. Could you enlighten us on this?

10. In considering the supplies which might be available to small fabricators, I wonder if you have taken into consideration these contracts which some of the oil companies seem to have with some of the rubber companies for promoting the sale of their tires through the retail filling stations. For example, on page 158 of the supplement of the Commission's report the proposed contract with Shell contains the following sentence: "Neither Shell Chemical Corp. nor the parent, Shell Oil Co., is engaged in the manufacture or sale of natural or synthetic rubber or products made therefrom, excepting that Shell Oil Co. has contracts with the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and with the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., which provide for the payment of a commission to Shell Oil Co. as compensation for Shell's assistance in promoting the sale of their products to Shell dealers, commission distributors, and jobbers." What effect do you think such contracts would have on the question whether Firestone and Goodyear would buy Shell's rubber, or refuse to buy Shell's rubber, and thus make it available for small business?

11. Judge Barnes, I would like to have your comments with reference to the "agreements" in the contracts with the proposed purchasers, where the purchasers say that they agree to "make available" certain specific percentage of their production to "small business". How could the small fabricator who found that he could not obtain rubber find protection under these agreements—specifically the following questions occur to me:

Is the small-business man to bring private suits, and if so under what theory of the law? And what is the likelihood that the courts will say to an individual businessman that he has a right to sue as a third party beneficiary of the United States Government? Since no small-business man is mentioned in these contracts, but the Government merely purports to try to protect an indeterminate class in these contracts, can the indeterminate members of this class have any standing before the courts as third party beneficiaries?

Then, may I ask the question as to which of these proposed purchasers the small-business man would sue? Is there any mechanism by which he would know which of these companies were failing to sell their agreed proportion to small business? Is there any requirement that the proposed purchasers make public their sales and customers or open their books for inspection?

What specific rights does a fabricator have under this agreement? Would there be any difficulty arising from the lack of a definition of small business? And does a small fabricator have a right to demand that a particular rubber company sell him supplies or does the rubber company have the right to choose its customers?

Assuming that the small-business man can sue, then as a practical matter how much would such a suit cost a small fabricator, and how long would it take to conclude the litigation, and what would be the prospects of his concluding the litigation before he has gone out of business?

On the other hand, if the Government is to police these agreements who is to do the job and how will it be done? More specifically let us consider the following questions:

Can the Government sue on the basis of damage for a breach of contract, since the Government will not have suffered any damage? Could the Government sue for specific performance of contract, and what State law would determine whether an action for specific performance could be brought? Would the right to sue differ according to where a plant is located, and would the Government have different rights under different laws in different States where the plants are located? If the Government is to police these agreements, what mechanism will it have for knowing whether or not the agreements are being lived up to, and what assurance are there that the Government will move promptly and that it can obtain relief before a substantial number of small-business men have gone bankrupt?

12. Judge Barnes, some of these so-called agreements in the contracts with the proposed purchasers are to the effect that the purchasers will make available certain specified percentages of rubber to small fabricators at competitive prices. I wonder whether to your mind this term "competitive prices" has any meaning other than that the integrated fabricator will make available to his small competitors rubber at the same prices and terms as he makes it available to himself.

13. Judge Barnes, I don't wish to go into the long list of past antitrust cases in which these big rubber companies and oil companies have repeatedly been found guilty or plead nolo contendere to charges of violating the antitrust laws, but I do want to ask you about a few of the recent and pending cases which seem to have a particular bearing on this disposal plan.

I am told that there is a case now pending in the courts of the District of Columbia involving the Federal Trade Commission and 20 big rubber and oil companies, and I am told that the proceedings arose because the FTC attempted to relieve pressure on small tire distributors resulting from the tire companies discriminating in prices among their different customers; I am also told that these proceedings were started in 1947, so that they are not concluded after 8 years of litigation. I wonder if you are familiar with this case?

Would you venture an estimate as to how long it will take before this case is ultimately concluded?

Do you know whether or not the discriminations complained of by the FTC are still being practiced by these companies pending the outcome of this litigation?

Is it your opinion that the rubber and oil companies will be less likely to discriminate against these small competitors than they have been to discriminate among their own customers?

14. Now I want to refer you to a few cases in which the big rubber companies have plead nolo contendere to charges of violating the Sherman Act.

In the Rubber Manufacturers Association case, the big four rubber companies plead nolo contendere on October 21, 1948, to a charge of conspiracy and combination to restrain trade in tires and tubes lasting from 1935, to date of filing the complaint in 1947—in other words, approximately 12 years.

Five days after the plea was entered in the Rubber Manufacturers Association case, the Government filed a criminal indictment charging Goodyear and others with fixing prices of rubber heels and soles, and in 1949 pleas of nolo contendere were filed.

In 1950 Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, Sears, Roebuck, and others were defendants

in 2 actions, 1 civil and 1 criminal, which charged these companies with fixing prices and exercising monopoly power to exclude competitors in the sale of batteries.

Now my question is this: Before approving the Commission's disposal plan, did the Department of Justice make investigations to find out whether or not the practices which were admitted in these cases have been stopped and whether or not the court orders are being complied with?

15. Judge Barnes, I understand that the case of *U. S.* v. *National City Lines* is still pending—that in this case you charge Firestone, Phillips, and Standard of California with a combination and conspiracy to monopolize trade in the sale of both petroleum products and tires and tubes. Can you assure us this if you win that case you will effectively eliminate the trade restraints charged in this case?

16. Judge Barnes, I would like to ask you about another case which is still pending; this is *U. S.* v. *Standard Oil Company of California et al.*, in which the Standard California Co., the Shell Co., and the Texas Co. are charged with monopolizing the entire oil industry in the Pacific States area from point of production to point of retail distribution.

The complaint in this case alleges, in paragraphs 72 and 73, that a formal civil action filed in 1930, in which a consent judgment was entered, and a formal criminal indictment in 1939, to which pleas of nolo contendere were entered, were against the same defendants—Standard, Shell, and Texas—but that these previous actions have been completely ineffective in preventing these companies from continuing to monopolize the oil industry of the Pacific coast area.

In paragraph 74 the Government further alleges that—

"Defendants' domination and control of the petroleum industry in the Pacific States area has become so entrenched and so overwhelmingly and generally accepted that it has persisted and will continue to persist and grow * * * and will continue to make it impossible for independents at any and all levels of the petroleum industry to compete effectively with defendant oil companies."

The same paragraph stated that the "business operations of defendant oil companies are conducted as if said oil companies were a single concern with single management."

(a) Now, first of all, Judge Barnes, is not this an admission on the part of the Government that Texas, Shell, and Standard Oil of California have monopolized the petroleum industry since 1930, and that so far the Government has not been able to stop them even though it has been successful in two antitrust actions?

(b) Secondly, Judge Barnes, when the Government filed its complaint in the California case it, in effect, vouched for the truth of the charges made, did it not, so that even though there has been no final determination of the California case, the Department of Justice believes that the charges it made in its complaint are true?

(c) How does the Department of Justice, therefore, Judge Barnes, reconcile its allegations made in the California case, with the assertions that the sale of the synthetic rubber plants to the defendants named in that case promotes free enterprise?

(d) Is it your personal opinion that if the allegations contained in the Government's complaint are true that the sale of the synthetic facilities to Standard of California, the Texas Co., and Shell will not enhance the monopoly position of these defendants and make it even more difficult for small independents to survive?

(e) Now check my memory on this: In the old Mother Hubbard case the Government had a similar charge against all of the major oil companies, concerning monopoly practices in markets all over the United States, and the Government dropped the Mother Hubbard case because it was too big to try, that is, there were too many companies to have in one suit; so it dropped that case with the intention of starting a series of smaller cases involving the separate regions of the United States, and this case of *U. S.* v. *Standard Oil of California et al.*, was then filed as the first of a series of cases to replace the Mother Hubbard case. Can you put me straight on this?

17. Now about your current suit against the oil cartel. Four of the oil companies to which the Commission proposes to sell the rubber facilities are named as defendants in that suit—that is, Texas, Gulf, Standard (New Jersey), and Standard of California. I believe that a fifth oil company, Shell, is alleged to be a member of that cartel, although it is not named as a defendant. Now my question is this: Do you feel confident that you will successfully break up the restrictive features of that cartel, if any exists, and that the restrictions on competition between these companies alleged to exist as to the production and sale of petroleum and petroleum products will not spread to the production and sale of rubber and rubber products?

18. The Attorney General's report is silent on the background of cartel control over natural rubber; I would like to know if the Department took the cartel question into consideration and, if so, what conclusion it reached concerning probable future control over natural rubber by cartel action?

19. I now refer you to the announcement made by Attorney General Brownell on September 30, 1954, in which he expressed disapproval of the proposed merger of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., and expressed the opinion that such merger would probably be in violation of the antitrust laws. In that announcement the Attorney General quoted with approval a statement in the report of the House Judiciary Committee on the Antimerger Act of 1950 concerning the meaning of an illegal effect upon competition, as follows:

"Such an effect may arise in various ways, such as an elimination in whole or in material part of the competitive activities of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition; increase in the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive, undue reduction in the number of competing enterprises or establishments of relationships between buyers and sellers which deprived their rivals of the same opportunity to compete."

I also point out that had the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger been consummated, Bethlehem would have then had approximately 30 percent of the steel capacity, although it would have still been the second largest steel company. In contrast, the Attorney General's letter has approved the sale of 31 percent of the country's butadiene capacity to a single company, and this will be the largest company in its industry.

In the light of the foregoing, I would like to know upon what basis the Department of Justice foresees an unsatisfactory degree of competition in steel and a satisfactory degree of competition in butadiene?

The Honorable CARL VINSON is a very fair chairman. He has been courteous to and cooperative with those of us who are opposing him on this sale of the rubber plants. He has already given me the assurance that my letter and questions have been sent to the Attorney General with a request that the answers be available Monday morning, March 21.

EXCISE-TAX RELIEF FOR THE REFRIGERATOR INDUSTRY

Mr. MEADER. 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. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4934, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that in computing the excise tax on refrigerator components, the sale price shall not include the value of a similar component accepted in exchange.

The language of the bill is simple. It adds to section 4112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the following new subsection:

(c) Sale price of certain refrigerator components: In determining the sale price of a refrigerator component, there shall be excluded from the price, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the value of a like component accepted in exchange.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of my bill would place the refrigerator industry on the same footing as the automotive industry with respect to the excise tax on replacement parts. In fact, the language of my amendment is as nearly as possible the same as the language of section 4062 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the sale price of automotive parts and accessories.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in this subject stems from the circumstance that one of the largest independent manufacturers of refrigerator components is located in my district. I refer to the Tecumseh Products Co., of Tecumseh, Mich., which employs some 4,000 of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, my objective is to remove the inequity which exists under the present law. The used component, traded in for a new or rebuilt component, was already taxed when originally sold. Therefore, including the value of the traded-in, worn-out component in the sales price of the new or rebuilt component, for which it is exchanged, results in paying the excise tax on that value a second time. This is unjust double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for treating the automotive industry in one way with respect to excise taxes on parts and treating the refrigerator industry on a different basis. My bill would eliminate that discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the tax loss from this change will not exceed $50,000, against which should be offset the cost of collection and the cost of accounting and bookkeeping incidental to the placing of a value on trade-in components. It is entirely possible there would be no net loss in revenue. Meanwhile, the administrative burden, both to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the taxpayers, would be greatly simplified if the tax were applied only to the cash received on the sale, and accounting for the traded-in component could be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the present inequitable situation is benefiting no one; that the second tax on the value of these traded-in components is a nuisance tax. My proposal should be adopted in the interest of eliminating discrimination, in fairness to the refrigerator manufacturers and consumers and to simplify the administration of the excise-tax law. It is, therefore, in the public interest.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF BUREAU OF NARCOTICS FROM TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have followed the devastating effects of narcotics upon all and sundry and its international implications since the twenties and I am very deeply disturbed that there should be any move to transfer the United States Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department to the Justic Department. My concern in this matter is not to be construed as implying any criticism of the Attorney General. I have the highest regard for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, but it must be recognized that the Department is not equipped to serve as an administrative and regulatory body in technical fields.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the problem of illicit narcotics is primarily international, it is of first importance that the Bureau of Narcotics be and continue in close association with the Bureau of Customs, under the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to better protect the public against the introduction of illegal narcotics into this country. My own customs bureau in Cleveland, of which Miss Albina Cermak is the director, is a very fine demonstration of the minuteness with which customs officials proceed in order to stamp out smuggling of narcotics in any form.

I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10, under an insertion by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, that the executive committee of the American Drug Manufacturers Association has approved a resolution protesting the proposed transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics to the Department of Justice. In my knowledge, the drug manufacturers and pharmacists have for many years worked in an atmosphere of constructive cooperation with the Bureau of Narcotics. If it were not for this, we would be even more flooded with illicit drugs than we are today.

It is my hope that the full implications of the suggested transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department to the Justice Department will be given very serious consideration by the Ways and Means Committee in the House or the Finance Committee in the Senate. I am sure my colleagues who have made the suggestions are not aware of the possibilities of danger it presents.

MORE SEVERE PENALTIES NEEDED FOR NARCOTICS VIOLATORS

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that enactment of more severe penalties would go far in stamping out narcotics addiction. It would enable narcotic violators who are frequently addicts themselves, to be subjected to a longer period of treatment and observation, and would at the same time have the important effect of removing from active participation in the drug traffic those offenders who may not be susceptible to corrective treatment.

I am today introducing a bill to fix the penalties at 5 to 10 years for the first offense, 10 to 20 years for the second offense, and life imprisonment for the third offense. In addition, my bill would provide a mandatory life-imprisonment sentence for anyone who sells, transfers, barters, exchanges, or gives away any narcotic drug or marihuana to any person who has not attained the age of 21 years.

The testimony of the Commissioner of Narcotics, Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Treasury-Post Office Departments, disclosed that where a State increases its penalties the bulk activities in peddling narcotics goes to another State. Obviously, with such a situation, it is the Federal Government's prime responsibility to attempt to control the illicit peddling of narcotics rather than one of local concern.

Mr. Anslinger testified as follows on page 211 of the hearings:

> You could not stop heroin from coming into the port of New York with all the forces you could marshal in this country. After it gets in, with all the thousands of ways the gangs have of distributing it you are not going to pick up that stuff with 250 men. You could not do it with a thousand men. The answer to stopping the traffic is penalties. You have a good law, but you do not have high penalties.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider my bill without delay.

THE LATE MRS. MARY HARRINGTON COSTELLO

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, over this past weekend I lost a beloved neighbor and a very great friend. My home city of Lowell, Mass., lost one of its finest citizens. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and our country lost a great American and a great patriot.

In every community throughout America there are men and women whose wisdom, unlimited comprehension, and consideration, together with kindness and leadership, seem to pull together all of the qualities and forces necessary to make life and living attractive, beautiful and inspiring. Mrs. Mary Harrington Costello did this and more for her home community and mine, Lowell, Mass.

Honored with life beyond three score and ten, Mrs. Costello's achievements and goodness and faith in her community extended through many years. She was the only child of the late John H. Harrington, the founder of the Lowell Sun. After her father's death in 1932 she assumed the responsibilities of the publishing of the Lowell Sun. The contributions she made to this newspaper during her leadership left their mark and helped to establish it as one of the great newspapers in America. Her knowledge of journalism, her sense of fairness, and her courage and constant effort to do the right helped to set the pattern of community and national respect for the Lowell Sun. Having succeeded her father as the president of the Lowell Sun Co., her sound judgment and wise counsel was respected and sought by many in the cause of community projects and undertakings. Her word of encouragement, her praise, and her faith were invaluable to so many. Her fight against communism and to preserve the free way of life in America was constant and effective.

Mrs. Costello was kind and generous and charitable. Perhaps never to be known are the many kindnesses and charitable acts Mrs. Costello extended to so many. Of this we are sure and that is the people of our wonderful community will miss the understanding heart and helpful hand of their constant and interested friend.

Mrs. Costello was born in Lowell and lived her entire life in my home city. Her marriage to Mr. Thomas F. Costello was blessed with 4 sons, 3 of whom survive. They are Thomas F. Costello, John H. Costello, and Clement C. Costello, all of Lowell and who are the principal officers of the Lowell Sun Publishing Co. After the death of her father and her husband, Mrs. Costello took over all of the responsibilities and direction of the Lowell Sun until such time as she could relinquish to them its management. During World War II, when all three of her sons served in the United States Navy, she again assumed the duties and operations of publishing the Lowell Sun. And her help in promoting the national defense was invaluable. In addition to her family, her countless friends will miss her greatly and long remember the many beautiful contributions she made to make life and living more pleasant and more happy for so many.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to include in my remarks one of the finest editorials I have ever read. Written by her eldest son, the publisher of the Lowell Sun, it seems to speak for everyone, as well as her devoted family. It is a beautiful tribute to a wonderful mother and a great leader. It is so worthy of the attention of everyone.

The editorial follows:

MRS. MARY HARRINGTON COSTELLO

It happens only once in a lifetime. It makes no difference where you are, who you are, or what you are. It happens but once to all people. Your mother dies. We hope it hasn't yet happened to you. Yesterday it happened to us.

If John H. Harrington was the father of the Sun, and it is a historical fact that he was away back in 1878, then it is true that his lone child, Mary Harrington Costello, was the mother of the Sun, for when Mr. Harrington died in 1932, Mrs. Costello mothered this newspaper creation of her father as a mother would nurture her children in a period of great stress.

Yesterday Mrs. Costello died at the age of 73. She had been ill of a heart ailment for some weeks, but death came suddenly for she had been feeling quite chipper earlier the same day. So the shock to those close to her was great.

Her influence for good on the Sun had been enormous for the past quarter century, and it is certain to be deeply, deeply felt for many years to come.

She was a wonderful and wondrous mother. She had a great and she had a big heart which finally just got too tired to keep pumping any longer.

She was a great lady, and a gallant lady. To her we now sadly say, "Hail and farewell. May your soul rest in eternal heavenly peace."

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. I was very deeply shocked to learn of the passing of Mrs. Costello. I attended Holy Cross College and was a classmate of John H. Costello. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman. Mrs. Costello was a great Christian and a very wonderful lady. I would like to spread upon the RECORD my sympathy to her family in this hour of their bereavement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have never seen a family more deeply moved than the family of Mrs. Costello, her sons, her daughters-in-law, and her grandchildren. I am so glad that she had the comfort and joy of them during her lifetime. Among my most precious possessions are letters written by her. She was kind to everybody, a really true Christian gentlewoman.

Mr. TUMULTY. She was a very wonderful woman and was very kind to all of us. I knew her son John very well. He was a remarkable athlete and student.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And you can understand what their solace and comfort must have meant to her.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes, I do; and her many other friends also.

POST OFFICES AND POSTAL FACILITIES

Mr. ARENDS. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a statement made yesterday by Postmaster General Summerfield. He declared that, although the volume of mail handled since 1938 has doubled, not one single post-office building has been built by the Government during that same period of 17 years.

Post offices and postal facilities are bursting at the seams—

Mr. Summerfield said—

and conditions are so bad in some of our cities that bulk mail actually is handled and sorted outside buildings, in the open air, rain or shine.

I submit that this condition will continue and grow worse unless we bring to an end this practice of trying to run the largest nonmilitary agency of Government on prewar income at postwar costs. It just does not make sense.

While Postmaster General Summerfield has done a great deal for improving the postal service and reducing costs, he cannot possibly put the service on a truly efficient basis, give the people the service they need and should have, unless he has the authority to operate his Department on the principle of receiving a fair return for value given. That's what the American people want.

I don't think it was the wish of our people to charge a 10-year postal deficit of $4 billion to the already overburdened American taxpayer. Our postal service, as in most other enlightened countries, should practically pay its own way.

Mr. Summerfield believes that our citizens are ready and willing to pay for better and improved mail service. His belief is verified by answers to several public opinion polls. I echo that belief. I believe that the wealthiest nation in the world can afford moderate increases in postal rates which will be reflected in improved service.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I cannot help but think of the vast amount of weapons for our national defense which could have been bought for $4 billion, the amount of the postal deficit for the past decade. The American taxpayer carries the burden of our inescapable military costs, and he is also obliged to carry the burden of the postal deficit.

I do not think it is asking too much to ask mail users to pay for their mail service. And I think they are willing to do so. In the end they will benefit.

TEXAS CITY TIN SMELTER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the give-aways of this administration and we are going to hear a great deal more. We will probably get a bill or a resolution on this floor next week involving part of those give-aways.

A new method of give-away, however, is the giveaway to foreign big business. There is only one tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere and that is at Texas City, Tex. There is only one source of tin in the Western Hemisphere and that is Bolivia. With the dismantling of the Texas City tin smelter, which is now advocated by this administration, we will then give to the world tin cartel, which controls all foreign sources of supply other than Bolivia and all foreign tin smelters, complete control of the tin supply of the world. Domestic consumers will then be at the mercy of these foreign suppliers.

RELEASE OF AMERICAN WAR PRISONERS IN CHINA

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, early in January of this year the United Nations sent an emissary to China to negotiate for the release of the American war prisoners. Amid a great fanfare of newspaper, telephone, and radio publicity, this emissary went to Peiping. He returned more than 2 months ago from this mission. For some reason, the bottom has dropped out of the publicity attendant upon this gentleman's trip.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the time has come for this emissary of the United Nations, and the United Nations itself, either to say that it has accomplished something toward the release of these American war prisoners or admit its dismal and unmitigated failure.

COMMISSIONED CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, everything that concerns the strength of the United States in these precarious times is automatically a matter for the most careful consideration by Members of the Congress. For that reason, we cannot remind ourselves too often that the foundation of our whole defense effort is the health of our people.

Partly because it is numerically small, partly because many of its officers do not normally wear the uniform in peacetime, it is easy to overlook the fact that the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service is an essential part of our defense forces.

The commissioned corps is, of course, one of our long-established uniformed services. Although composed exclusively of professional people, the corps has been closely identified with our Armed Forces from its inception. Officers of the corps serve under military-like discipline; they are appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate; they agree to serve where the needs of the Service require; their rank and tenure are comparable to rank and tenure in the Army.

The President is authorized by law to declare the commissioned corps a military service in time of war, and this authority was, in fact, exercised by the President during World War II. But even before this formal declaration was issued, the commissioned corps was operating to all intents and purposes as an integral part of our military machine. Its officers were assigned to a great variety of war-related activities, both here and abroad.

Officers of the Public Health Service were detailed as a malaria-control mission so that the Burma Road might be built, and some officers of this mission walked out to India on Stilwell's famous march. Others served with the American Typhus Commission. Some served in the Arctic and some in the Tropics to maintain health services so that the vital construction on the Inter-American Highway and the Alaska Highway might go forward. They served with Army service commands and with civil defense in the continental United States; with the strategic bombings surveys in Germany and Japan, and with military government in both the Pacific and European theaters. As a matter of fact, the present distinguished Surgeon General, Leonard A. Scheele, served in military government on General Eisenhower's staff and Dr. Howard F. Smith, Chief Quarantine Officer of the Philippines, accompanied General MacArthur on his secret departure from Bataan.

The Public Health Service is the medical arm of the Coast Guard and Public Health Service officers provide medical service to the officers and men of the Coast Guard on land and sea. Over a thousand Service officers served with the Coast Guard during the war, and some were lost on LST's and some were captured as prisoners of war.

One of the great campaigns of the Public Health Service began during the last war and resulted in the virtual stamping out of malaria in this country. Until this concentrated campaign with the newly discovered DDT, great areas of the United States had been in the grip of this soul-sapping disease, one of the most terrible human scourges of all time.

Throughout history, typhus has been one of the greatest causes of casualties among armies—until World War II. The development of a vaccine against typhus at the National Institutes of Health, the Public Health Service's great research center at Bethesda, Md., was a major factor in controlling the spread of this dread disease among our troops, with the result that not a single American soldier died of typhus during the last war.

Physicians, scientists, and technicians of the Service have given their lives in their search for knowledge of disease. A half a dozen Public Health Service medical officers died during the conquest of yellow fever. Death has likewise stalked the laboratories and taken its toll of Service personnel working on typhoid fever, tuberculosis, smallpox, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, tularemia, meningitis, psittacosis, "Q" fever, and a form of typhus with the exotic name Tsutsugamushi.

The dangerous work goes on today, in the laboratories of the Public Health Service—the great National Institutes of Health, at Bethesda; the Communicable Disease Center, at Atlanta; and the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati.

Officers of the Public Health Service are on duty today in such isolated places as the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea; they are on missions in Liberia and Indochina with the Foreign Operations Administration.

The Service maintains one of the most unusual institutions in the world at Carville, La., a hospital, a home and a research center for people suffering from the ancient disease of leprosy. More knowledge about this terrible disease has been won since the establishment of this unique institution than anyone was ever able to acquire in the preceding 2,000 years.

As they have been doing for the last century and a half, officers of the Service, wherever in the world they may be stationed, are seeking to push back the frontiers of knowledge about man's unseen enemies.

Many battles have been won in man's age-old war with disease—but only battles the war goes on. Diseases like malaria, typhoid, yellow fever, diphtheria that used to account for a substantial portion of the deaths in this country have been brought under control.

But complaisance with respect to the infectious diseases can be a dangerous thing. Plague, the black death of the Middle Ages, is a case in point. It got in at the port of San Francisco but it never obtained a foothold among our people, thanks to the vigilance of the Public Health Service.

Plague is endemic to this day in the wild rodent populations of our Western States. The constantly watchful eye of the Public Health Service and the other public health agencies of these areas have kept it from spreading to the rat populations of our cities.

The unbroken record of the Public Health Service in guarding the health of the American people, to say nothing of its services with our fighting forces, goes back almost to the beginning of the Nation itself.

The Public Health Service was first established as the Marine Hospital Service by act of Congress in 1788, 2 years even before the seat of government was permanently established in Washington. From that time on, the Congress of the United States has never relaxed its efforts to safeguard and improve the health of the American people.

It supported the work of the Public Health Service at a time when there was very little knowledge about the causes of disease—long before the science of bacteriology came into being in the latter part of the last century.

Although the Service, quantitatively, has remained small—it has only 2,500 officers on active duty today—its responsibilities have been greatly increased over the years. As knowledge and responsibilities grew, the need for a disciplined staff of competent professional people became apparent, and in 1873, the Commisioned Corps system was established by regulations of the Treasury Department. This was 10 years before the career and merit principles were introduced into the general government service by act of Congress.

From the time of its establishment, the value of a corps of professional health officers in the Federal Government has been demonstrated. As the responsibilities of the corps continue to grow, the need for establishing such a corps firmly in the law was recognized and in 1889 the corps was placed on a statutory basis. It was a sound action.

Today, in addition to its regular work, the Service has new and important responsibilities in the field of national defense and is in the process of developing a strong reserve corps of commissioned officers who can be called to duty if a major national emergency develops.

The great strength of America is in the health of her people. A healthy America is important now as perhaps never before in history. One of the things that has helped to make America strong has been the quiet, persistent work of the Public Health Service through more than 150 years of war and peace. It is a winning team. Let us keep it that way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will be very much interested in having legislation passed to give the veterans suffering from that dread disease a presumptive service connection.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would be interested in that. I may say to the gentlewoman that, speaking of the Public Health Service, she well remembers that after World War I when we were confronted with this great problem of the returning veterans, and before the Congress and the country had time to adequately prepare for their care, it was the Public Health Service that stepped into the breech.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I know they did a great deal of work. I also know the very fine work the gentleman did regarding veterans' hospitalization and the handling of veterans' claims and other veterans' matters. The gentleman was instrumental in getting the first rating of service connection for veterans without medical affidavit but using instead lay affidavits.

Mr. MILLER of California. I should say that that distinction is not one which may be claimed by the gentleman now speaking, but instead was earned by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, for without her help it would never have been accomplished.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We both worked on it.

A FOREIGN POLICY FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I speak this afternoon for myself alone. But what I have to say has been discussed

with many of my colleagues, and I believe that the general thoughts expressed are theirs as well as mine.

This Congress and this Nation must once again attempt what mankind throughout its history has tried but failed to do. We must move swiftly now to set in motion forces which will insure peace. For we now confront humanity's annihilation by the A-bomb, the H-bomb, the U-bomb, the C-bomb, on hand or being perfected.

We had a warning of this several weeks ago in the Atomic Energy Commission's report on the effects of the H-bomb. We had a sign of this just a few days ago in the Nevada tests of what the press hinted was a possible "trigger mechanism" for the H-bomb. The explosion shook the earth, and the flash lighted up the sky of 13 Western States. How many more would be shaken and bathed in the deadly light of what the trigger mechanism itself was designed to set off.

We know, of course, how to wage war. We have the means to wage it. We know, too, that America and the free world have suffered unconscionable abuses from the Communist powers, abuses which in a former day would have justified a stand to arms for redress. Yet we do not live in a former day when the musket over the fireplace was the answer to tyranny, or when the fleet alone seemed sufficient to keep the enemy at bay. We live in the year 1955, in the age of nuclear weapons.

We delude ourselves if we think that a war between America and the centers of Communist power could be limited to the conventional weapons which brought us victory in the past. Our tactics are shifting rapidly to nuclear weapons. We may assume that the same is true of the enemy. Even if leaders on both sides showed a moment of qualm before they used nuclear weapons, they might be compelled by the force of popular passions to use at once what they themselves have proclaimed all along to be the guarantor of a swift, easy, and decisive victory.

There is only one avenue away from the dead-end of worldwide destruction. It does not lie in any agreements to limit the use of atomic weapons if war should come, important as such a limitation may be. It lies in trying to clear up some of the gathering tensions which lead, often by accident, to war.

The tensions of the world today are not of our making. We did not invent colonialism. We came to birth as a Nation because we fought colonialism. We did not invent disease, ignorance, and poverty. We came to greatness as a Nation because we set ourselves the task of fighting all that lays a blight on human existence. And we have every reason to be inflamed when we hear that the best of what we try to do is often portrayed abroad as merely grasping and selfish. But the question for us is not what they ought to do, but what we ought to do; not whether it is just and wise for them to complain when they suffer no wrong from our hands, but whether it is wise in us to invite the distrust of other peoples because of what we, as a great power, have the responsibility and the capacity to do—but have failed to do.

For example, 30 nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, representing more than one-half of mankind, will confer at Bandung, Indonesia, a month from today—and for what purpose? In part, at least, to air their grievances against the United States because we have failed to take the lead in their common fight for freedom from colonialism and feudalism, in their common hope for economic aid on an international basis, in their common desire for a position of non-involvement in great power rivalry.

In Europe, Germany is still cut in two. One hundred million people groan under Soviet rule in the enslaved states of Central and Eastern Europe. The partial rearmament of Western Germany is underway, despite the bitter opposition of half the people of Germany and France.

Short of war—if then—it is not within our power to overturn the present rulers of Moscow and Peiping. Yet the main game is still to be played for around the globe. All too often, we forget this to our disadvantage, while Moscow and Peiping keep their thoughts focused all along on what we forget. We forget that the stakes of the game are the hearts and minds of the people of Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and Latin America who as yet remain outside the net of Communist power; who want to live in peace, to be the authors of their own history; who will respond to any leadership which raises the banner of hope that what they want so desperately can be theirs to have.

We are not now raising that banner of hope. We seem bent on vetoing it, not by design, but unwittingly. For our foreign policy in the recent past has zigzagged into the wayward paths of agonizing reappraisal, unleashing Chiang, massive retaliation, the New Look, liberation, and other tired slogans. Now at last we are back to the policy of containment developed by the last administration. To that policy of containment, we are adding German rearmament; we have a military agreement with Spain; we have formed the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and we have exchanged mutual guaranties with Chiang.

These military alliances should not be viewed as ends in themselves. In the nature of the case, the weaker partners in these alliances will always be suspicious of the stronger ones. Unless all are bound together by vital economic, political or social interests, military alliances tend to come apart at the seams when they are subjected to the acid test of war.

Our view of a policy of containment ought to be that it is merely an expedient. It is to gain through strength a margin of time in which to do the real work before us of removing the causes for worldwide tensions. We have instead viewed that policy as the end itself, while the tensions continue to pile up unattended to, to hammer against and sometimes breach the military retaining wall we have built against them. When we side with the colonial against the anticolonial countries in the U. N., we lose the respect of half the world struggling to be free. Our refusal last May to join the special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, on the ground that we could not afford the $80 million annual cost until there was disarmament, sounds thin to the free world. In Europe, no rhetorical flourishes can disguise the fact that, although we cry "unification" for Germany and "liberation" for Eastern Europe, we have offered no method to achieve either aim.

If there is no desire to ease tensions of this sort, then a thousand plausible reasons can be found to explain why this failure of will is really the highest form of statesmanship. Yet a beginning of some sort must be made; and the time to do it is now. For every day that passes increases the mining of uranium for military use, increases the stockpile of atomic weapons, and brings us 1 day closer to the abyss of nuclear disaster.

Somebody has to make a start. In June 1947, Gen. George Marshall, in his speech at the Harvard commencement, spoke 3 or 4 sentences that inspired the world with their universal promise of a better day. Can anyone doubt today that those 3 or 4 sentences, when translated into concrete yes-and-no decisions, at least temporarily saved Western Europe for the free world?

President Eisenhower can continue this same work. He may not have the power to impose the American national will for peace on Moscow and Peiping. But backed by the national will, he has the power to ease age-old causes for tensions which now keep the world in a constant state of alarm, and which Moscow and Peiping exploit to their own advantage.

The time has come for President Eisenhower to speak out boldly and constructively before the Congress and before the United States in this vein—let him say to the world—

"We Americans want peace, and we want to do our part to secure the peace.

"To the people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East who are about to meet at Bandung, we say this. If you agree, we will ask the U. N. to take over Formosa as a trusteeship, to assume its defense against the aggression that threatens it, and to promote the development of self-government by the Formosan people. If you agree, we will reverse our refusal to join the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, and will work with you, both inside and outside the U. N., for social and economic advancement, and against colonialism and feudalism.

"To the people of Europe, we say this. West German rearmament is under way, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany; a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the U. N.

"To all people of all nations, we say this. We reaffirm our hope to end the destructive phase of nuclear development, and to seek man's advancement through science. We rededicate ourselves to work in humble hope with the rest of the world toward the goal of permanent peace, for our own continued survival is hinged to the prospect of permanent peace."

Let our President speak in that vein. Perhaps the details are not exactly these. Perhaps more should be said, and perhaps less. But what is said must be in the main current of our historic mission. It must reflect the American genius for ideas and action, the American tradition for independence and justice, the American hatred of war. What is said must ask for action by the Communists, not for paper promises. It must be based on what the Communists themselves could not reject without the risk of being rejected by their own peoples.

Whatever the outcome, this Nation could then face the future secure in conscience that we are striving to do that which is responsible and right.

What the President says will be rendered meaningless unless it is backed in depth, in the halls of Congress, on the streets and farms of this country, in the hearts and minds of every American. I am confident that if he does speak in his way, he will have that backing in depth. The people are hungry for dynamic leadership.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for this fine, bold presentation. I think he echoes the hopes and beliefs of a great majority of the people of this country. I would like, if I may, to make a few observations and to comment on what seems to me to be one of the large points made by the gentleman. I refer to an issue that is currently in the news, that of the proposal for a foreign-aid program for Asia.

As we all know, a trial balloon was sent up by the State Department people, by Mr. Stassen, 2 or 3 months ago, before Congress convened, and it was indicated that a substantial program of aid for Asia would be proposed. The interesting thing about that trial balloon is that it apparently has been shot down, not by the Members of Congress, as undoubtedly many expected, but apparently by the Secretary of the Treasury and his associates. In fact, I think it is significant, too, that on Monday of this week, when Mr. Stassen held a press conference after meetings at the White House, he stated that this original program as conceived and proposed by him and by the State Department people has been cut more than 80 percent, and apparently they themselves are now doubtful about offering such a program for fear it will not meet with a good reception.

I cannot understand the timidity of Mr. Stassen and the State Department people, because, unfortunately, we have produced a climate of opinion here and in the country which apparently is the opposition of some people to such additional programs. A book has been recently published called Billions, Blunders, and Baloney, which is a cynical title representing that type of thinking. I believe that the creative thinking of the people in the State Department has pretty well been stifled and bluffed out by this type of opinion we have heard.

I venture to suggest that history will record that those Members of Congress in the past who voted for these programs voted wisely, and that that money is some of the best money we have spent, that the spending of money in Asia, as conceived by the State Department and those who are out there working with those people, has been a proper investment and one that will save the future expenditure of many dollars in excess of these amounts.

I do not pretend to know the temper of the Congress here, as a new Member, but I think I do know somewhat the disposition of some of the new Members of Congress on this side of the aisle. It is our belief that we are ready to go ahead with such programs and that the President and the Secretary of State have more support here than they realize if they want to go forward. I think they would have to come up here and fight for such programs, that they might risk defeat, but there is support for substantial programs of this kind if they want to come up here and ask for them. They have been too fainthearted in shaving them down, in emasculating these proposed programs and ideas.

I should like to make one other comment here, as I see some of our veteran Members are with us. Many of you may feel that it is presumptuous on the part of some of us newscomers to discuss a subject of this kind. Certainly, it is presumptuous. We must admit that. But traditionally if freshmen have any assets they can offer a body, whether they are in college or coming into a new body, it is usual that they have a little excess energy and occasionally a fresh point of view. That is what I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to offer us here today and what I would like to offer as a fresh point of view, and to say to the President and the Secretary of State: Be a little bolder, be a little less fainthearted; perhaps you have more support here than you know of.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his very forceful statement and its clear recognition that the economic as well as the political and social side of our foreign policy is of vital importance.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, may I first say that I am in agreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin in his statement that in the age of nuclear weapons we have no alternative but to move swiftly to put into effect those activities which will insure peace.

Real peace is more than the mere absence of war. And one of the preconditions to peace is cooperation on the part of all to help the needy to help themselves to a higher standard of living and to develop conditions of stability and well-being the world over.

I firmly believe that the United Nations is the most effective tool we have yet devised as a meeting place for the nations of the world. And I also firmly believe that one of the greatest contributions the United States can make to an enduring peace is the contribution to the United Nations' expanded program of technical assistance.

It is my understanding that the recommendation made yesterday by the Committee on Appropriations was for $4 million. It seems to me it would be a tragic mistake if this is not changed to the $8 million sum which the President recommended.

To those who would say that we cannot maintain the level of foreign aid because it is too expensive, I would suggest that they contemplate for awhile the figure of the richest man in the graveyard.

We cannot afford to lose our liberty. We cannot afford to build the fantastic defense force that we would have to build if we were really friendless. And we cannot afford to stop building our defenses at home and abroad. But let's not forget one thing. We are sometimes apt to feel that the money we send abroad for either economic or military aid is going to defend someone else. I don't think we should ever lose sight of the fact that in building the strength of the free world, we are building our own.

In the very heart of our foreign policy, lies the question of emphasis. Let us strengthen the economic aid programs and the point 4 program. Let us increase technical assistance; let's show the people of Asia and Africa that we are anxious to see them achieve the status they so badly want. Let us never lose sight of the fact that the biggest single factor in world politics today is the desire—the needs of the millions upon millions of human beings who have just emerged from colonial status or who are still in that status. There are several things those people want. They want first—to be treated with common decency—to be treated as equals—if not brothers.

They want economic stability. The new nations of Asia and Africa are rich in natural resources—and in the opinion of experts could easily support their present populations at a standard of living far exceeding anything those people have ever known—but that standard can never be reached without great changes in their technology. Point 4, the technical-assistance programs of the United States and the United Nations, is a very effective technique, or can be if it is pursued in a wholehearted fashion.

All of this can be attacked as globaloney, do-goodism. And it is so attacked in a great many quarters. I am at something of a loss to account for the growth and apparent acceptance of the idea that it is wrong to do good; but I suppose it is so considered by the people who consider Christ's command—"That we cast our bread upon the waters"—to be impractical, because they forget the next phrase—"That it will come back to us a thousandfold." And so it is with the things that I have urged. If we cannot find it in our hearts to urge independence

for an Asiatic group simply because we believe that men have a right to be free, then let us back it because we know that freemen will fight harder than men who have a grievance. If we cannot fight economic injustice and disease because we hate them as we hate communism, then let us fight them because healthy men and secure men make better friends of democracy than do desperate men. If we cannot be generous, then let us be prudent. Whatever our motives, it cannot help but be to our profit.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her warmhearted and heart-warming expression.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin and I wish to commend him on a most forceful and hopeful statement. With his permission I would like to associate myself with him in the ideas he has propounded. Particularly, I agree with my distinguished colleague in his statement that the policy of containment, achieved in a large measure by the formation of treaty organizations and military alliances, should not be viewed as an end in itself.

I was quoted in yesterday's press as saying that the only way to assure peace is by total preparedness, and I say that again. But I say it with reference to the present only. I do not intend to convey the thought that total preparedness is the answer to all questions.

Containment, as evidenced by our preparedness to meet the threat of armed aggression with arms, is at best an expedient, a means to an end.

We must never lose sight of the fact that merely containing in a given area of the world those ideologies which are inimicable to the free and democratic world is not the end we seek. The end we seek is world peace and security.

We must go beyond containment and demonstrate to the other nations of the free world by thought, word, and deed that we do have a main objective—the objective of world peace.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleague from Wisconsin in urging leadership by the American people and their Government in a positive plan for peace.

The science of preventive medicine not only includes emergency medicinal application, but seeks to attack the root causes of the sickness and to prevent its reoccurrence by the application of a positive plan of attack. Likewise, the science of peace must include emergency facilities in the nature of military preparedness. It must also attack the blight upon the peace of the world at its root causes, by the application of a positive plan to enable us to win and maintain the peace and to prevent its future destruction.

In seeking to eliminate sickness and disease, medical science uses all known machinery. So too, should the freedom loving nations of the world use every possible agency that brings nations together.

Our Government has not been using all of the machinery available to it in its fight for peace. The time has come to recognize that we have bypassed, ignored and in many cases half heartedly supported the facilities of the United Nations, a body specifically established to promote world peace. On rare occasions such as the address of the President of the United States in 1953 on the sharing, for peaceful use, of atomic energy, our Government has made a great world impact. But we seem to deliver one blow for peace, and then duck back into our shell. Indecision and contradictory statements bring disillusionment in their wake.

The United Nations is the place where we can work for the support—active, vocal, and insistent—of all of the nations who believe in freedom and justice. The United Nations is the place where the machinery exists to attack poverty, disease, the lack of individual opportunity, and the mangling of human rights. These are the root causes of war.

It is in the U. N. that we can meet those who have high hopes for their own economic and spiritual development. It is there that we can mark so clearly the hollow and false claims of peaceful intention that come from Communist leaders. We must bind the representatives of these other hopeful nations to us with a sense of partnership, a feeling of deep understanding and a proof of sincerity, by performing that of which they know we are capable. It is there that we can answer with a positive course, the cries which will come from Bandung, Indonesia in April. Those who have failed to press for such active leadership at the United Nations have always resorted to the hollow cry that an emphasis on such a program would detract from our concentration on military strength and would indicate a softness toward the threat of armed Communist aggression.

Now is the time to assert and to reassert that the fight against communism, like the fight against disease can only be won by attacking on two fronts, the front of the emergency cure, that is, military preparedness, and the front of the elimination of the root causes of war, that is, a positive program to win the peace. The front of military preparedness and superiority of weapons of war is undoubtedly the only language which the leaders in the Kremlin can or will understand; but the people of India, the people of Central and South America, the people of the Middle East are being wooed not by Communist military strength, but by the mirage of a communistic economic Utopia, that is why we need the second front. We cannot afford to relax in anyway if we are to continue to win the battles along the first front. Yet we must face the fact that we are today losing the battles along the second front because of fear and shortsightedness.

It is the President of the United States who makes our foreign policy. It is the Congress which must back him with the necessary tools to win the war for peace. As in the Second World War, so now, it is time to open up this second front and to persist until we have made the fullest use of the machinery which we have so far left rusting in an atmosphere of detrimental and ignorant disuse.

It is my hope that the Congress will restore and maintain our fullest military strength, and I hope that it will create legislation which will speak for and reflect the hopes and prayers of our people, that our Government will rise to the challenge not only to prevent war, but to build peace.

I join with my colleague from Wisconsin in saying that I hope we may continue to fight along these lines.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUIGLEY. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, apropos of the excellent remarks made here today, particularly those that detail so correctly the manner in which our State Department for the last 2 years has gone all the way round the barn only to come back to the once bitterly denounced policy of containment, I am reminded and would like to point out that the author of that particular policy, the Honorable George F. Kennan, is a distinguished constituent who resides in the 19th District of Pennsylvania.

I am also reminded as I am sitting here that this happens to be an anniversary date of an event of no particular importance in world history but of considerable importance in my young life and also in the life of Mr. Kennan. It was exactly 1 year ago today that Mr. Kennan made the decision to withdraw as a candidate for the seat in Congress that I now have the honor to occupy. I do not believe I am expressing any state secrets when I point out that Mr. Kennan's decision was an important turn in the road that finally led me to these Halls.

If Mr. Kennan were here as my Congressman, I feel that he would be eminently well qualified to speak for me on matters of foreign policy, but since I am here as his Congressman I have an understandable reluctance to attempt to speak for him.

However, I cannot help but feel that if the fates and the voters had otherwise decreed and Mr. Kennan were present here today as a Member, certainly at this point in the proceedings he would have taken the floor long enough to congratulate and to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I believe Mr. Kennan would be the last to contend that in devising the containment policy for Soviet Russia he was thereby suggesting anything that was to be or to become a permanent way of life. The containment policy at its best was a brilliantly conceived but badly misunderstood passing phase of a dynamic foreign policy.

I think there is little to be gained by Mr. Kennan or his Congressman now taking time to have the satisfaction of saying, "I told you so." What has happened has happened. What is past is

past. The past is nothing more than a prologue. If we are to reach peace, and if we are to attain our goal, we must devote our efforts toward the future. There is nothing to be gained and much to be wasted by looking back into the past and reminiscing over past achievements or recriminating over past failures. I think what has been said here today is important not so much for the details—details with which many may agree or disagree, but I think what is important is the fact that we have here expressed the ideas and the thinking of many of the younger Members of the Congress who are willing to look to the future. It is important to look to the past. It is important to remember our American traditions—traditions which I believe the gentleman indicated involved almost passionate dedication to freedom and independence and a hatred of war. It is important that we should look and cling to those traditions for renewed hope and inspiration. But the hope of this Congress, the hope of this Nation and the hope of freemen everywhere is to look to the future and not to be afraid of a new idea but to earnestly seek new ways and new means to solve the problems which we face. I believe in this way we can hope to gain the long sought—the everlastingly sought goal of peace in this world. Insofar as the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who spoke here today have made a small contribution toward that goal, I firmly believe they deserve the gratitude of the Members of this House and the people of this country.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for his thought-provoking and incisive report. There have been many times in our history when the administration and the Congress were not united. I would like to point out that one of the very encouraging things about the situation at present is the fact that the administration can depend upon the wholehearted support of both parties in the House of Representatives, whether of the majority party or the minority. We today, without question, are facing not only as a nation but as a part of the free world itself, the greatest menace that civilization has ever known. Only by this wholehearted cooperation of both parties and of the administration can we be sure of our life as a nation. In conclusion, I would like to say I am personally proud—very proud of the leadership of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives today. They have shown the kind of statesmanship we need in peace as well as in war.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on his very courageous stand. I can appreciate the courage it took to come before this body with some ideas which, to my mind, pose a new and refreshing thought. Whether or not we may all agree entirely with everything the gentleman has said, certainly I commend him on the excellency of his speech and upon the fact that it may cause some soul searching on the part of the American people relative to what our position should be as leaders of the world.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I shall be very brief. I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who have spoken today for the sober, serious, and conscientious considerations expressed. Implicit in the statement of each is a plea for inherent morality in our foreign policy.

In order not to take the time of so many who desire to express themselves along these lines, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, we are gratified to learn from reports of the administration and from press news and reports of progress that has been made in the Middle East. One of the Arab States that have heretofore concentrated all their efforts on their internal and regional problems, first and foremost on their hostility to the State of Israel, has now for the first time openly acknowledged the greater threat hanging over the Middle East as a whole and threatening its security, its freedom, and its way of life from the north. This Arab State, Iraq, has now joined with our stanch ally, Turkey, in a treaty of defense cooperation which, I am told, has the full blessing of our administration and of our British ally.

While this new treaty seems to be a most gratifying event. I venture to express the hope that in the enthusiasm of that new alliance our Government will not sacrifice older friendships and alliances more firmly established and of a more stable promise. The new Iraqi-Turkish Treaty is open to the adherence of any other state in the area of the Middle East and outside that area, except for the State of Israel. According to that stipulation and, also, according to professions of continued hostility on the part of Iraq's leaders and Government, Iraq's new alliance with Turkey in the West has not led her to adopt a more moderate and conciliatory attitude toward the State of Israel, our friend and ally. The new treaty, while gratifying in that it strengthens our wall of containment against the Soviet menace, contains therefore nothing to allay the concerns of the State of Israel with regard to the unwavering hostility of the Arab States, to their professed resolve to attack Israel sooner or later, and to the imbalance being created by our new alliances with Arab States and our offer of military aid to them.

The state of tension and hostility being what it is in the Middle East, there can, of course, be no question today of Israel and the Arabs joining together in one collective security arrangement against the common danger. However, while we ally ourselves with Iraq and aid her with arms and equipment—and I understand that we are ready to do the same with regard to other Arab States as soon as they are ready—we should now urgently see to it that no imbalance is being created by this policy of ours. When we offered armaments and an alliance to Pakistan, we were quick to tell India that she could have the same as soon as she wanted it. Now, again, we are offering alliances and arms to one side in a conflict, both sides of which are friends of ours. We should now offer a similar alliance, a similar guaranty of security, and similar military aid to the State of Israel, which most certainly should be the cornerstone of any democratic alliance in the Middle East.

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

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the remarks of my colleagues because they reflect many of the same hopes and doubts, misgivings and confusions with respect to the conduct of our foreign policy which I often hear in my own district.

With the present tenuous balance between an uneasy peace and a catastrophic war, I believe there is an increasing effort on the part of people everywhere to find, in our foreign policy, positive and constructive goals which offer some hope of a permanent peace.

Certainly there can be little question of the necessity for the United States, as the leader of the free world, to maintain military might as a deterrent to the aggressive ambitions of Communist Russia. Nor can there be any real question of the necessity of committing our military strength, as we did in Korea, to halt the advance of the Communist military machine.

But surely our foreign policy must have a broader goal than simply drifting from crisis to crisis in our effort to contain Communism. If I judge the uneasiness of the men and women in my district with any degree of accuracy, it comes from an inability to sense a broader purpose in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, despite the tensions which exist today, I still believe that peace is possible. But I must say, with great reluctance, that I think peace is possible only if the United States, through our President, sets forth in language capable of being understood and believed by the entire world a policy which has as its objective the establishment of a permanent world peace.

Certainly one aspect of such a program must be the elimination of conditions of economic distress which continue to plague whole continents and hundreds of millions of people, and from which inevitably spring the seeds of war.

The United States has the greatest industrial plant and technology in the world. But unless we develop a far more imaginative means of sharing this development with our less fortunate world neighbors, we shall have failed in what I believe to be one of the essential tasks of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, we as a Nation have always had great powers of imagination and determination, and indeed it is these

powers which in large measure have led us to our position of world leadership.

But I submit that there has never been a time in our history when it was more essential for us as a Nation to apply our powers of imagination and determination in the establishment of a foreign policy which is truly constructive and positive and which has as its goal, not the prevention of seemingly isolated wars, but the winning of a peace as broad as the world itself.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. I thank the gentleman.

Let me direct your attention to page 6 of this address which you have just made. As I read it, it says:

> But to the people of Europe let me say this: West German rearmament is under way because Russia leaves the West no other alternative.

The sentence I direct attention to is:

> But if you agree and if Russia will carry out her part of the program by withdrawing to her historic border.

Do I understand that this plan of yours depends upon the acquiescence of Soviet Russia?

Mr. REUSS. It depends not on the acquiescence in words by the Soviet Union but on action by the Soviet Union in actually withdrawing to her borders. If she wants to stand before the world as the force which is preventing German unification, as the force which is preventing the freeing of the now satellite countries, as the force which is preventing the formation of a European federation dedicated to peace, then let her so stand before the world. I cannot imagine a better propaganda weapon which we could possibly have.

Mr. TUMULTY. The plan which the gentleman proposes requires the withdrawal of the Soviet Union for it to be practical.

Mr. REUSS. It requires the withdrawal of the Soviet divisions back to her historic boundaries. If she fails to accept such plan or proposal she will then stand stigmatized before the whole world as the one single force which is barring the solution of these problems.

Mr. TUMULTY. I notice it is the gentleman's position in this bold new plan that we say to the people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East who are soon to meet in Bandung:

> If you agree, we will ask the U. N. to take over Formosa as a trusteeship, to assume its defense against the aggression that threatens it, and to promote the development of self-government by the Formosan people. If you agree, we will reverse our refusal to join the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, and will work with you, both inside and outside the U. N. for social and economic advancement, and against colonialism and feudalism.

Am I to infer that you would amend the plan which has been adopted by this Congress or resolution which we passed supporting President Eisenhower on Formosa?

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for putting that question, because far from its being my intention to change any policies formulated or adhered to by this Congress, I would prefer to strengthen them. Specifically, any trusteeship agreement we make with the United Nations should provide for the full force of the United Nations and the United States forces to prevent Communist aggression against Formosa, just as we provided in our resolution of the other day, to which both the gentleman from New Jersey and I myself fully adhere; but let me say further that a trusteeship is in no way inconsistent with our present position respecting Red China's aggression, of opposing recognition of Red China and of opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Let me say further that it is in no way inconsistent with the authorization we gave to the President to defend as related territories the islands of Quemoy and Matsu if they are deemed necessary to the defense of Formosa; nor is it inconsistent in any way with our continuing recognition of the Republic of China, of which Chiang is the exemplar, and with our continued adherence to the mutual defense pact with Chiang ratified just the other day by the other House of this Congress.

Mr. TUMULTY. I thank the gentleman. Now may I ask just 1 or 2 more questions? At the present there sits in the United Nations a nation miscarried as Poland, which has been demonstrated to be nothing less than the alter ego of Soviet Russia, the stooge and tool of Soviet Russia. The gentleman's theory proposes the withdrawal of the Soviet Union to her 1939 borders; but would that in any way alter the real composition of the present Polish state?

Mr. REUSS. There is nothing in my proposition about the eviction or noneviction of Soviet Russia from the United Nations. However, since the gentleman from New Jersey asks, I support the President of the United States in his view that for the present it would hurt, not help, our national security interest to attempt to withdraw recognition from Soviet Russia or to move to put Soviet Russia out of the United Nations.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am not speaking of Soviet Russia and her membership in the United Nations, but in the gentleman's proposal that Soviet Russia withdraw to her 1939 borders—and the gentleman states that there will be a free Poland—will that Poland be any different than the so-called nation that now sits in the United Nations falsely representing the oppressed people of Poland? Which fact has been brought out by a committee of this Congress as recently as 3 months ago.

Mr. REUSS. Of course, it will be different from the pitiful satellite and slave-state people who now represent Poland in the United Nations. I am sure the brave people of Poland would throw off the Communist tyranny the first chance they got and breathe the good air of freedom again. It would be my pride and the gentleman's too, I am sure, to welcome the representative of the new free Poland to the United Nations.

Mr. TUMULTY. Having said that the gentleman now agrees with me, it is a good way to start this whole new program of the gentleman's by ousting the false government that now usurps Poland's position in the United Nations?

Mr. REUSS. No, I do not agree with the gentleman. He is entitled to his view in the matter. I think the substantive creative thing should be done first, then with the flat of our swords we can get rid of the little problems.

Mr. TUMULTY. This is the first time I have ever heard that problem referred to as a little problem.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman from New Jersey knows what I mean. The most important thing is that the men and women of free Poland be able to lead their own free lives.

Mr. TUMULTY. I appreciate the gentleman's answers. The gentleman will agree with me that the presence of this usurping band of stooges in the United Nations is a shocking thing from the moral as well as the leadership point of view?

Mr. REUSS. Yes; any injustice and cruelty wherever practiced shocks me as it does the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. In the gentleman's speech, which was very well delivered incidentally, I noticed that in discussing colonialism he did not implement his policy of colonialism by condemning the present occupation by the greatest colonial power in the world of Ireland when he condemned the satelliteism of the Soviet Union. Is there any reason for withholding comments in reference to that in the gentleman's oration?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman from New Jersey has misunderstood my remarks. I condemned colonialism and I condemn again in the most forthright terms I know of slavery and satelliteism, to use the gentleman's phrase, which the Soviet Union now practices.

Mr. TUMULTY. How about Ireland? I would like to hear the gentleman's comments on the colonialism now practiced on Ireland by a member of the United Nations, Great Britain, who will take over the trusteeship of Formosa and the trusteeship of these natives in Central Europe.

Mr. REUSS. I will leave those comments to the gentleman from New Jersey for tomorrow. I know he will do a magnificent job.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my remarks to those of my colleagues who have already expressed their views on this most important subject. The need for a positive approach to this complex problem has become more and more obvious with each passing day. However, even though obvious, nevertheless, ignored. Concrete suggestions to bring this ideal about have been very ably presented to this body. I refer specifically to the need for a more efficient use of the United Nations and the winning of the uncommitted peoples of Asia. In the interest of peace for the world, the threat of complete annihilation must be admitted and not ignored.

No peril has ever before confronted mankind to compare with the fear of

atomic war. This fear of war is today universal in the minds of humanity. No amount of bluster on the part of statesmen nor the pratings of dictators can force the peoples of any nation to voluntarily start a war today.

Are all the centuries of civilization to end because man finds himself so fear crazed that he can only find a way out of the cage by fighting, tearing, and rending himself and all others to eternity? The will to overcome such a fatal solution must predominate all other thinking now. It is not safe to wait for time to find the solution. The will to work for peace must be unleashed throughout the world. No new idea can safely be suppressed until it has been fully explored. New ideas are needed as never before in the history of mankind. The same dynamic leadership that has created the means of our total destruction must now be channeled toward a peaceful solution through renewal of our faith in God and a return to spiritual values. The people of our great Nation and the people throughout the world need leadership now to remove the terrible grip of fear which has permeated their everyday thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks by including in the RECORD a part of a speech by Judge Learned Hand entitled "Rational Inquiry and the Triumph of Wisdom":

Our Nation is embarked upon a venture, as yet unproved; we have set our hopes upon a community in which men shall be given unchecked control of their own lives. That community is in peril; it is invaded from within, it is threatened from without; it faces a test which it may fail to pass. The choice is ours whether, when we hear the pipes of Pan, we shall stampede like a frightened flock, forgetting all those professions on which we have claimed to rest our polity.

God knows, there is risk in refusing to act till the facts are all in; but is there not greater risk in abandoning the conditions of all rational inquiry? Risk for risk, for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry. I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists to win or lose. Such fears as these are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together; they may in the end subject us to a despotism as evil as any that we dread; and they can be allayed only insofar as we refuse to proceed on suspicion, and trust one another until we have tangible ground for misgiving.

The mutual confidence on which all else depends can be maintained only by an open mind and a brave reliance upon free discussion. I do not say that these will suffice; who knows but we may be on a slope which leads down to aboriginal savagery. But of this I am sure: If we are to escape, we must not yield a foot upon demanding a fair field, and an honest race, to all ideas. "Blame not before thou hast examined; understand first and then rebuke. Answer not before thou hast heard; interrupt not in the midst of speech." Those words were written nearly 2,000 years ago; they came out of an experience already long and refined in the fires of passion and conflict; they are the product of a wisdom, bought by ages of bitter trial; and by that wisdom alone shall we be saved, we, who boast ourselves to be the apostles of a faith in the eventual triumph of wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from Barbara Jones, recording clerk, Wilmington Monthly Meeting of Friends, Wilmington, Del.:

MARCH 14, 1955.

Hon. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL,
Representative, Delaware State,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear SIR: The Wilmington monthly meeting of Friends would like you to consider the following points in relation to the Universal Military Training and Reserves Act No. 2967.

This act would not only cement conscription into our American military system, but it would introduce a new element into our national life. For the last 15 years Congress has regularly re-enacted selective service legislation. On each occasion it has fixed a terminal date. This has constituted recognition of the principle, that conscription should not be a permanent feature of our military setup. The bill No. 3005 has a termination date; however, bill No. 2967 has no termination date and would therefore survive our present temporary draft law.

A permanent universal military conscription act will necessarily have its effect upon American thinking. Its existence would amount to an endorsement that has never been placed upon conscription in the past. Future generations not only grow up with the necessity of performing military service, they would also see it as an unchanged feature in their lives.

The personality of our country will change in many ways presently unforeseen, and possibly unforeseeable. A people that accepts military conscription as the only possible means of survival is likely to give up the search for a better answer.

Has the process of erosion already gone so far that we cannot find a more satisfactory solution? We are merely following the footsteps of other older nations. We should insist on a better way out of our dilemma.

Americans cannot endorse a permanent Military Establishment because we do not believe that armed force is the final arbiter of our destiny; we do have a faith that with God's help men will be able to devise ways of living together in peace.

BARBARA JONES,
Recording Clerk.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and congratulate my distinguished friend and colleague from Wisconsin not only for his ability in the presentation of the remarks which he has made but on the courage which he has displayed in bringing to the floor of this House this all-important subject. It is a subject which I feel must be discussed. It must be discussed at length by the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. It is a question on which the gentleman from Wisconsin and I may find details in which we are in considerable disagreement. On the other hand, there are many things in his prepared remarks today with which I find myself in complete accord.

I want to say this, as did the great Voltaire of old, that even though I might disagree with everything that you have to say, I would fight to the death for your right to say it. I am proud of the courage which you have demonstrated in bringing to the floor of this House these remarks today.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States is indeed a question which calls for sober, prayerful, and soul-searching thought and consideration by every Member of this body. For too long, especially during the last 2 years or so, we have been in an abysmal fog as far as our foreign policy is concerned. The people of the United States are entitled to know in which direction we are headed. The United States Government, perhaps under the leadership of the executive department but, if that leadership is lacking, then under the leadership of the House of Representatives of the United States, must chart a course which is in line with and symbolic of the great progress which has been made by America during the time we have been a great Nation among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that our way of life, our America itself, our democratic institutions exist by reason of their very virtue. If ever we are destroyed, it will not be when we have been destroyed by an outside foreign foe; it will be when we have become so weak from within that we have no knowledge and no desire to have any knowledge of what our course in foreign policy is. If and when we are destroyed, or if and when we destroy ourselves, it will be when you and I have forgotten the past, have become indifferent as to the present, and utterly reckless as to the future. The thing, Mr. Speaker, that has made this country the great Nation that it is is that, like the great ship of state described by Oliver Wendell Holmes, "Sometimes we sail with the wind and sometimes we just sail against the wind, but all-important is the fact that we always sail; we never drift or lie at anchor." We must chart a definite course in foreign policy, one which will once again raise the prestige of this Nation among the nations of the world so that there will never be any doubt as to the position of the United States Government on any phase of foreign policy. We may be right and we pray that we are and shall be; we may be wrong, but may God forbid that we shall ever be in doubt on any issue upon which the national honor of our Nation depends. It may be that we shall have to make a completely new reappraisal of our foreign policy and strike from it any portion which is un-American and conflicts with those principles which are basic and fundamental to our way of life.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]

for his excellent statement which reflects deep conviction and a thorough understanding of our foreign policy problems. It offers a positive approach in these crucial days as we hover perilously near the brink of atomic disaster and the horrors of worldwide nuclear war. I wish to associate myself with him in his observations and with the remarks of other colleagues who express similar views on this vital subject.

Mr. Speaker, the people in many areas of the world are looking for a way to free themselves from colonialism and its brood of poverty, misery, and disease. They seek a better life for themselves and their children and the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of freedom. We all know and understand how the seeds of Communist imperialism have been able to take root and grow in such fertile areas of the world, feeding on the hopelessness and despair of millions and millions of these unfortunate people.

We of the free world should take positive steps to prove our sincerity of purpose and dedication to the principles of decency and human freedom which have made our Nation great.

In the past decade we have taken our first hesitant steps on the road toward international cooperation and understanding relations with other nations. Our participation and support of the United Nations, the genius of the Marshall plan, and the bold new point 4 program are milestones on the road to world peace and justice of which we can be justly proud. But when we view the vast scope of the job which remains to be done, this pride becomes tempered with the realization of the pitiful inadequacy which these approaches have achieved and the opportunities which have been lost to make more significant progress.

Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of our foreign policy cannot be measured in the number of TV speeches by our Secretary of State or the air-mileage records he sets in his trips around the globe. Nor can it be described in slogans or broad policy declarations which seem to change every hour on the hour. These tactics only divide and confuse our own people and have an even worse effect on our allies who receive only fragmentary reports.

What will be the judgment of world history when our foreign policy decisions are viewed in the cold light of retrospect? Who will be able to explain the inconsistencies of our foreign policies? How our Nation could on one occasion embark courageously to repel naked aggression in Korea, acting in concert with other peace-loving countries through the established channels of the United Nations; but, having driven back the combined armies of the original aggressor and the hordes of Red Chinese at the cost of the lives of thousands of our young men and billions of dollars of our resources, we now refuse to contribute even token assistance to programs designed to attack Communist aggression at the roots of its power? This we did by opposition to the establishment of a loan fund to aid underdeveloped countries improve their basic public works, power facilities, health and education programs, and other badly needed programs necessary for their social and economic development.

Such a broad and vital technical assistance program has been envisioned in the establishment of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—SUNFED. The proposed SUNFED program was to be financed by a $250 million fund. Our share was to have been $80 million, an insignificant amount when we consider that our defense expenditures cost about $1 billion a week.

But the United States delegate to the United Nations refused to participate in SUNFED at the 1953 fall meeting of the UN Economic and Financial Committee, citing our heavy burden of defense. This was in line with President Eisenhower's speech of April 16, 1953, in which he outlined our policy with respect to international economic cooperation. He said:

> The Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction.

Thus our participation in SUNFED-type programs was put on an either/or basis—we will spend money either for military defense or for increased economic aid, but not for both. Mr. Speaker, this either/or policy is a tragic mistake in judgment.

The consequences of such a policy are already seen in further Communist inroads in southeast Asia, in the loss of Dien Bien Phu and northern Indochina, and, equally important, in the loss of confidence among our friends in the have not countries of the world. This feeling is perhaps best expressed by the Philippine representative to the U. N. Economic and Financial Committee, Miguel Cuaderno, Sr., when, following the United States torpedoing of SUNFED, he said:

> It is indeed disheartening for the underdeveloped countries to see this, their white hope, wither away under the cold indifference of the metropolitan industrial powers.

To pigeonhole the SUNFED proposal, he added, would be slamming the door of economic opportunity and development in the faces of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world who have come to regard the United Nations as the instrument of their salvation.

It is imperative that we reverse our shortsighted opposition to the objectives of SUNFED before next month's meeting in Bandung, Indonesia, of some 30 have not nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. It is not too late for us to supply the necessary positive leadership to demonstrate to the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world that we are sincerely and humanely interested in their welfare.

The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Technical Assistance has heard testimony urging that funds be authorized for our participation in SUNFED. The need has been adequately demonstrated.

The stakes are large and the cost of failure fearsome to contemplate. We must not, by default, pass up this opportunity to strike a severe blow at the rulers in the Kremlin and their plans for subversion and conquest of the most populous areas of the world. At the same time, in the same blow, we can prove to the world our determination to wage a continuous war against disease, poverty, suffering, and misery among the peoples of these exploited countries.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to insert excerpts from an article by Justice William O. Douglas, which appeared in the New Republic of March 12, 1951. Because of its farsighted importance and depth of understanding of the Communist menace among underdeveloped nations, it is especially timely in light of our statements here today.

The article follows:

A WORLD IN REVOLUTION

(By William O. Douglas)

The world is different than we in America have thought. Wendell Willkie and many other reporters who traveled the back countries told us what was happening; but we did not listen. The plain fact is that the world is in a revolution which cannot be bought off with dollars. There are rumblings in every village from the Mediterranean to the Pacific. A force is gathering for a mighty effort. We think of that force as Communistic. Communists exploit the situation, stirring every discontent and making the pot boil. The revolutions which are brewing are not, however, Communist in origin nor will they end even if Soviet Russia is crushed through war. The revolutionaries are hungry men who have been exploited from time out of mind. This is the century of their awakening and mobilization.

What I saw and heard as I traveled this vast territory that lies under the southern rim of Russia reminded me very much of what I had read about other revolutions. The spirit which motivates these people is pretty much the same as the one which inspired the French and the American Revolutions.

The abuses against which our American forebears protested in 1776 were piled high. They are listed in our Declaration of Independence: dissolution by the king of legislative bodies; corruption of judges; maintenance of a standing army and quartering of troops among the people; imposition of taxes without the consent of the colonies; transporting citizens beyond the seas for trial of offenses committed here. These and other practices of the king brought our people to a boiling point; and we declared ourselves free.

The complaints of the peasants of Asia are just as specific as those in our own Declaration of Independence; and to the people involved they are just as important. I have talked with them in many places across this wide belt and found them alive not only to their problems but to the solutions as well. These people, though illiterate, are intelligent.

The people of Asia have a catalog of specific complaints. The absence of medical care always comes first. The absence of schools is always second. Then comes land reform. These people have a passion for land ownership that Americans can understand. We expressed it in our homestead laws and in the great westward movement that built a Nation out of the wilderness. Next comes the desire to learn how to farm the modern way. The right to vote, the right to elect representative government, the power to expel and punish corrupt officials—these too are important claims to reform. Finally, they have a new sense of nationalism. It reflects itself in many ways—the growing sentiment in some countries of the

Middle East to nationalize their oil and keep the profits for themselves; the desire to have local capital a partner with foreign capital in developing the nation; an exultant feeling of independence and resentment against intermeddling by outside powers.

There are professional agitators who stir this brew of discontent; but the force comes from the masses. I have not seen a village between the Mediterranean and the Pacific that was not stirring uneasily.

American foreign policy has never been addressed to the conditions under which these revolutions flourish. Democracy, peace, aggression are important words to us; but to those in the hinterland they are apt to be hollow and meaningless. America's voice, when heard in this poverty- and disease-ridden belt, often sounds coarse and cheap—not because we intend it but because we do not know the world in which we live.

We tell about our high standard of living, how well our workers eat, the fine houses they live in, and it sounds like boasting and bragging. We send technical experts abroad to help in seed selection, soil conservation, malaria control and the like. But we never raise our voice for reforms of the vicious tenancy system of Asia under which increased production inures to the benefit of a few. We seem to forget that health programs unrelated to land-distribution projects, minimum wages, maximum hours of work, and the like merely increase the number of people among whom the existing poverty must be rationed.

We talk about democracy and justice; and at the same time we support regimes whose object is to keep democracy and justice out of the reach of the peasants for all time. We put billions of dollars behind corrupt and reactionary governments which exempt the rich from income taxes and fasten the hold of an oligarchy tighter and tighter on the nation. The fact is that America has been so engrossed in providing a defense against communism that we have lost the initiative. Our great weakness has been our negative attitude. We have been anti-Communist. We have been pledged to root it out and expose it for all its ugliness. We have taken up the hunt inside the country for every human being who was, is, or may be, a Communist. Yet no matter how feverish our efforts, the red tide of communism seems to spread abroad. We are seized with panic as the waters lap at feeble dikes. So we rush to the support of every group which opposes Soviet communism. That puts us in partnership with the corrupt and reactionary groups whose policies breed the discontent on which Soviet communism feeds and prospers.

This negative attitude, the policy of merely defending against communism, is one reason for our default. The other basic reason is that we have relied more and more on our military to do our thinking and planning for us. Beginning in 1945 with the fall of Japan we entrusted most of our attitude toward Asia to the Army. The military made policy for us. It is no reflection on the military to deplore that fact. The situation in Asia is delicate and complex. It requires astute handling at the political level—the best that we can muster in skill and understanding.

As a consequence of our negative attitude and military approach to problems, the tide of Soviet communism has picked up momentum. The trend will continue; and the part of the world on which communism has not fastened itself will become smaller and smaller as long as our policy is merely negative or dominated by military thinking. The Communists are not merely anti-status quo. They have concrete programs of political action in every country. If we are to regain the initiative, we must use our ingenuity to invent ways to aid the peasants in their revolutionary aims. We must take over the guidance and direction of these revolutions if we want a free world.

We have thought we could save the world from communism by dollars. It is, however, ideas not dollars that count the more in this campaign. Dollars are secondary. They must be conserved until an honest, progressive government comes into power. Then they can be used in select ways to help the natives build a new economy.

America is fitted by tradition for directing and guiding the revolutions that sweep the earth. We won our freedom by revolution and set the example which today inspires the peasant of Asia. We cannot remake the world in our image; but we can help those who are seeking an escape from squalor to find alternatives to communism. We cannot do it by talking democracy to these people. We can do it only by making our foreign policy understandable in terms of their aspirations: medical care, education, distribution of land to the peasants, modern agriculture, free elections, independence from foreign domination. If we took that stand not only in rhetoric but in action, the political implementation of the program would be relatively easy. The Philippines, already the showcase of Asia, could be transformed into a healthy, prosperous, democratic community.

India and Israel are examples of the strength and stability that democratic forces can mobilize. These nations have domestic programs that make communism internally an empty threat. What Israel and India have done can be done elsewhere.

There are liberal forces in practically all of the Asiatic countries which can do the same. At times they are either in a minority position in the cabinet or outside the government completely. But each country has men who have the dream of a new freedom for their people, who have the character and that has existed from time out of mind. In ability to rid the nation of the feudal system other words, there is both the leadership and the energy within these countries to accomplish the necessary programs of social reconstruction.

We must be, and remain, strong as a military power in case Russia shifts from political to military action. But meanwhile our only real defense against communism is a political offensive, a political offensive with action rather than with rhetoric. The hour is late; but so long as world war III has not struck, it is not too late.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by Justice Douglas deserves careful thought and consideration. There is also much food for thought given by Columnist Dorothy Thompson in today's Washington Star. She calls attention to the danger of reckless statements made in the Congress and in the press which label every realistic appraisal of foreign policy as a move that spells appeasement. I hope every Member of the Congress will have an opportunity to read her timely and thoughtful column. In it she also points to the danger in statements that frighten and confuse our own people and which increase the tensions which lead to war.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am glad to associate myself with my colleagues here today who see the need for a more realistic approach if we are to win the hearts and minds of the freedom-loving people everywhere in the fight against Communist aggression and all forms of totalitarian tyranny.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

I think, too, that it is a healthy thing for the younger Members of Congress to discuss foreign policy. I am the youngest Member on this side of the aisle, and I am very much interested in these remarks that have been made concerning our foreign policy.

I am sorry that I missed some of the gentleman's original remarks. I do not happen to have a copy of his statement, but I should like to ask the gentleman one question. How does the gentleman propose, under his plan, to require the Soviet Union to draw back to its borders, to compel them to do so?

Mr. REUSS. The suggestion is that the President should tell the world that if the Soviet Union will withdraw to its borders, we, the free world, will do the following: There will be German unification and a free, united Germany. The 10 countries now enslaved by Soviet Russia will be free and will become members of a larger central and eastern European federation. Then united Germany and those 10 nations to be liberated by this action would be without arms to make aggressive war—arms which, over the years, have been Soviet Russia's main excuse for some of the outrageous actions of which she has been guilty.

I do not for one moment suggest that Soviet Russian would agree to such a plan. I do not know. We cannot tell until we try it. If we try it and if we succeed, then we will have gone a long way toward removing the tensions of this world. If we try it and we fail, then we will have for the first time clothed ourselves in the armor of righteousness with respect to a united Germany and a free Eastern Europe and to a wholesome order in Eastern Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] has expired.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield to me further, have we not done that in Europe in the case of Austria? Have we not proposed that Austrians be allowed free elections? The Soviet Union will not permit that. Let us take a country that wants to be free now and one that is not behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. REUSS. Certainly it is very true that Soviet Russia has outrageously dragged its feet for 10 years on the question of a unified Austria. I think the proof of a sound American foreign policy is to be found in the fact that today in Austria, whether one goes to the French or the British or the American or the Soviet zone, one will find that 99 percent of the Austrian people are firmly on our side. One will not find that in other areas of Europe today, because we have not pursued a similar policy there.

What I am suggesting is that we put before the people of Europe, free or enslaved, a plan, a program, a formula which will hold out to them some hope of freedom and peace.

Mr. HOLT. Let us turn to a part of the world that is in the newspapers today, Formosa. It is my opinion that time and time again the President of this

country, the United Nations, and the free world have shown their good faith. I wonder how much more we can do to get the Soviet Union to believe in our good faith so far as the peace of the world is concerned. Speaking still of the situation in Formosa, is it my understanding that the gentleman desires that Red China be admitted to the United Nations?

Mr. REUSS. I cannot imagine why the gentleman would make that statement, since he must have heard me say just a moment ago that I am emphatically opposed to recognition of Red China. I emphatically oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations. I emphatically adhere to our treaty recently made with Chiang Kai-shek for the mutual defense of Formosa. I emphatically adhere to the provisions of the recent resolution of this House, for which I believe the gentleman voted and for which I voted, to defend Formosa against Red aggression.

What I am saying is that we should get ourselves in a good moral position so that we can appeal to the 1 billion uncommitted people in that portion of the world and get them on our side so that we do not have to go it alone if war comes.

Let me say further that if the gentleman now or later has any suggestion for the improvement, for the making more creative of the modest proposals here offered, I hope he will see me so that we can work together for the peace I know we all want.

Mr. HOLT. Have we not shown our good intentions by wanting to have Red China settle the Formosan question, but Red China will not agree?

Mr. REUSS. I suggest that the less we let ourselves be perturbed and nudged from our path by Red China the better. If the gentleman will recall my remarks, I mentioned Red China not at all. I am not in favor of appeasing Red China. I am in favor of building up a strong alliance of freedom-loving peoples so that if you and I have to fight for Formosa we can do it knowing we are fighting on the side of righteousness.

Mr. HOLT. Is it not a fact that we have been doing that through the wonderful agreement that Secretary Dulles entered into on behalf of the United States, the Manila Pact, which in one part will temporarily halt the Communist aggression, and in the second and third parts will use economic and technical assistance by the great importance for the first time of recognizing subversion for what it is? Does not the gentleman agree that is a step in the right direction?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman entirely agrees that that is a step in the right direction. Now we must clothe those bare military bones with the life that comes from the economic, social, and political proposals such as those under discussion this afternoon.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman agrees with the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration and the fine job Secretary of State Dulles has done?

Mr. REUSS. I emphatically agree that in the military sphere the administration is doing a job that is close to adequate. I very often wish they would be more forthright and strong in their military requests here. I will back them to the hilt when they are. But militarism alone will not save the world. What we are talking about here is using the thoughts that have been in our Christian heritage for many years in the field of politics and economics and social life.

Mr. HOLT. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks about colonialism, which after all was under a different administration. I am glad this administration has corrected it. If we are to spend more money on this economic and technical assistance, how can be do it and at the same time vote for a tax cut?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I object. I think there is another special order.

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP FOR FORMOSA

Mr. LAIRD. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a very interesting discussion has been carried on here on the floor of the House of Representatives about a "new foreign policy" for the United States. I cannot see any new foreign policy in the suggestions which have been made here on the floor of the House this afternoon. Most of the suggestions which have been made would merely be a return to appeasement and to handing over to international communism everything it wants.

The suggestion which was made on the floor this afternoon by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] for U. N. trusteeship for the island of Formosa must not go unanswered. This 84th Congress on January 25, 1955, enacted a resolution which announced to the world that our policy was and would continue to call for the defense of the Island of Formosa. The suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] merely muddies the water and actually is an attempt to destroy much of the effect of the solidarity which was expressed by this Congress on the defense of Formosa. It would indeed be a great mistake if from this discussion on the floor of the House of Representatives it were reported throughout the world that we in America are giving serious consideration to a U. N. trusteeship for Formosa. Our policy to defend Formosa has been ably presented in the resolution which we have already passed in this 84th Congress. The suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] for a U. N. trusteeship of the Island of Formosa should certainly at this time not be given any serious consideration by this House. Furthermore, we cannot afford to give our Communist enemies the impression that the United States Congress is divided on the issue of defending Formosa. Such suggestions are only serving to endanger the peace and the lives of our citizens. The road of appeasement leads to a U. N. trusteeship for Formosa. Certainly we do not want to go down that road today and we should overwhelmingly maintain our support of our previously passed Formosan resolution.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 179, Rept. No. 221), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 3322) 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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Government Operations now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. 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 with or without instructions.

SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his able presentation and especially for the effort to which he has gone in the preparation of his remarks. I think that his approach is sound and I find myself in agreement with much that he has said.

I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin or any of his colleagues who have supported him with their collateral remarks have conceived that they are setting down a new foreign policy for the United States of America. In my opinion, they have simply added thoughts which they have developed on subjects which have been discussed before and have in a sense, in this particular instance, enlarged those thoughts.

Those of us in the United States face a double- or triple-barreled problem in

the field of foreign policy. We all know that the Soviet Union represents a very potent military threat to the free world. This is a very real challenge and one that we will have to face for many years to come. Without minimizing that threat in the slightest degree, and with the realization that we must even improve our military readiness in the face of it, I suggest that this is not our only immediate problem.

The danger which the Soviet Union presents to us and the other democratic nations is not, however, exclusively a military one. It is also political, social, and economic. The Soviet Union, as a great world power, has very large military forces. This is one problem. The Soviet Union, as the representative of an ideology and a political system, is another problem and, in many ways, a much more complex one. Totalitarian communism is an idea and a program. It is something which we, in the United States and all the other democratic nations, oppose completely and absolutely, but it is an idea and program which has had many successes throughout the world. These successes are largely predicated on the existence of poverty, for communism is a philosophy which is peculiarly able to exploit poverty and discontent. It is my belief, however, that Communist control can be achieved only in such depressed areas. In all others it must resort to force.

It is this fact with which we, in the United States and particularly those of us in Congress, must concern ourselves, and it is with a particular facet of this problem that I would like to deal today. In spite of the tremendous advances made in techniques of production of both food and industrial products, millions of people throughout the world live what is, at best, a marginal type of existence. This is a fact of life in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America. It is also a fact of life that it is in just these areas that communism has its greatest appeal. It is in just these areas that the democratic ideal has been losing out to the totalitarian philosophy. This is not because of any inherent fault in democracy, but rather because, as has been said many times already, people quite naturally are more concerned with a full stomach than they are with freedom of speech, press, or religion.

Yet, there is no need for these peoples to turn to communism as the one way of life which might enable them to have a decent standard of living. Indeed, quite the reverse is true for it is certainly undeniable that those nations with the highest standard of living are also those most stanchly defending the democratic philosophy. The nations of the West have much to offer other nations as an example of what it is possible to accomplish, and still establish and maintain democratic traditions. This is particularly true of the United States which has behind it a long record of democratic liberalism coupled with a tremendous economic success. Unfortunately, it can be stated quite categorically that we have failed to make these things clear to the less fortunate peoples of the world. We have, instead, been throwing away a great fund of good will which was ours.

This ideological loss, it seems clear, has come about because we have refused aid to these peoples when they desperately needed it, and, instead, have said that we were interested solely in setting up military defenses against Soviet encroachment. We have said to them, in effect, that though we sympathize with their aspirations, we are concerned mainly with the establishment and maintenance of stable governments on the periphery of the Soviet Union which is interpreted to mean defense of ourselves primarily.

Such an attitude leaves us little hope of actually winning the support of these nations in anything except the military field and probably augurs poorly for success even there. We must take note of the aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America for the establishment of economies which are free of outside domination and, at the same time, provide their citizens with a decent standard of living.

The ways and means of accomplishing these objectives are well within our grasp. We already have a limited program of technical assistance in operation and, considering its small scale, it has done an enormous amount of good. It is indicative of what could be accomplished in this area. The next steps must now be taken and they have already been proposed. In March 1951 the United States International Development Advisory Board, under the chairmanship of Nelson Rockefeller, reported to President Truman. The Board recommended, unanimously, the establishment of what is now called the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, or SUNFED. This project, under the auspices of the United Nations, is designed to supply the basic needs for the development of roads, railways, canals, port installations, and sources of power in the underdeveloped countries. It would also aid in the establishment of schools to train the labor force, and hospitals to promote health and hygiene.

These projects, it is true, cannot be considered to be self-liquidating in the financial sense. They would not produce foreign exchange and would furnish very low yields on a short-term basis. But they are essential to any well-developed economy. Indeed, experts have pointed out that in underdeveloped countries 60 percent of the overall financial investment must be in this field or there will be great risk of building a very shaky economic structure which would be constantly in danger of collapse. The underdeveloped nations want to become part of the 20th century world and they know they can only do this by making radical changes in their economies. The help which would be theirs, if the SUNFED proposal is adopted, will aid them to step out of the past and into the present. Then, and only then, may we expect to see economically stable governments established capable of becoming worthwhile and steadfast friends of the United States.

Opponents of this program have charged that the adoption of this program would mean giving the rest of the world a blank check enabling them to draw immeasurable funds from the United States. This simply is not true. Under the plan the funds appropriated would be under the control of a board composed of both the nations giving the funds and those receiving them. Fifty percent of the membership on this board would be reserved for the nations making the contributions. The remaining 50 percent would be made up of members representing receiving nations. Further, the United States, as the largest single contributor, would undoubtedly be able to name the director of the whole operation and we would, in these ways, have a large voice in determining its direction.

Here, in brief form, is a proposal which would give great impetus to the fight to establish democracy in all those areas of the world as yet uncommitted in the struggle between democracy and totalitarian communism. It is a program designed to give meaning to our past statements of faith in democracy and the free-enterprise system, and to show our willingness to aid in other than military ways. Military defense cannot be neglected in the face of the continuing threat from the Soviet Union, nor would I so advocate. Indeed, it strikes me as dangerous to reduce our Armed Forces to the extent already proposed, but we must realize that we face multiple problems to which there is no single answer—not even military force. SUNFED would attack one of these problems at its very source by building the basic industries and equipment necessary for an industrial economy. Unfortunately, the SUNFED proposal already has been once turned down by the United States and the other "have" nations. That response to the urgent needs of the world's less fortunate peoples resulted in the following reply from Miguel Cuaderno, the Philippine representative at the United Nations:

> It is indeed disheartening for the underdeveloped countries to see this, their white hope, wither away under the cold indifference of metropolitan powers.

Such was the response to our refusal. Imagine the hope that would be engendered and the friendship that would be endurably established were we now to reverse our position and advocate the adoption of this program by the United Nations. It is reasonably certain that our advocacy of this step would insure its success. President Eisenhower has recognized the desperate need for such a program, but he has tied its adoption to worldwide disarmament. Must we wait? Indeed, can we afford to wait? As I have already pointed out, and as we all know, the struggle with the Soviet Union is one which we are losing in every area except that of military defense. Our loss is due, it seems to me, to our concentration on this area. As population grows throughout the world, so does poverty. It is this fact which is uppermost in the minds of millions of people throughout the world. So long as we continue to disregard the impact of endemic poverty, we cannot expect to insure the allegiance of the so-called underdeveloped countries. We, in the United States, are concerned with the threat of aggression from the Soviet

Union, but large areas of the world are concerned with getting enough bread and butter from day to day. Nor are they enthusiastic over the idea of becoming expendables in a power fight between the Soviets and ourselves. From our point of view, defense against Soviet aggression is one barrel of this double-barreled threat. We are keeping it well oiled and loaded with ammunition. The other barrel is the economic problem. We cannot allow rust to settle here either. SUNFED is a proposal for great and positive help in this area. It is of great importance in the fight against Soviet communism. It would also mean gains for the American economy in a more direct sense. As these primitive economies, based on simple agriculture and mining, change under impact of the technical assistance programs, we may look for ever greater markets for our own products. This is graphically illustrated by figures comparing our export trade with Canada and Latin America. In 1938, the last prewar year unaffected by the catastrophe of World War II, Canada imported $41.3 worth of goods of all types per capita from the United States. On the other hand, Latin America, much less highly industrialized than Canada, imported only $4.6 worth. It would seem clear that as industrial output rises, importation also increases. Though this fact is not the most important reason for the adoption of this program, it is worth considering in connection with the cost of SUNFED. Our military program is already bold and dynamic. Now is the time to bring our diplomatic and economic leadership up to the same level.

The program I advocate here today is not one which would immediately solve all our problems or those of the world. To think so would be an idle and dangerous hope. But it would be a tremendous step in the right direction, not only in terms of the global struggle in which we are now engaged, but in terms of the peaceful world we all hope and pray will one day be ours to live in. We still have a choice. Will it be SUNFED or unfed, for the underdeveloped nations of the world? The decision is in our hands.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Does not the gentleman feel that increasing technical assistance output, the SUNFED program, increasing our Armed Forces, is a little inconsistent with the move to reduce our national income through a tax cut in the amount of some two and a quarter billions?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not think it is any more so than our actions since last year have been inconsistent with the $7 billion reduction which the Congress granted at that time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Yes, but the gentleman is now proposing, as I understand, to go even further in the matter of technical assistance, to embark upon a very extensive SUNFED program, to increase our Armed Forces; how is that possible and at the same time reduce our income by two and a quarter billions?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman's question, I believe, is predicated upon a desire which apparently is in his mind that the financial balance, the balancing of the budget on paper is the sole consideration of the American way of life and of democracy. I do not go so far, sir, as to say that in order to balance the budget we must let the rest of the world go whistle.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I do not wish to go so far at this time as to say I am opposed to SUNFED or further technical assistance, but as the gentleman probably knows, I do feel that we must certainly take into full consideration our financial limitations. When we embark upon new and larger programs we must know where the money is coming from to pay for them.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I think it is well within the economic capability of these great United States, especially in the prosperity we are now enjoying, to extend ourselves a little further in this area to fight communism.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is highly fitting on the occasion of the eve of celebrating the birthday of St. Patrick, that great patron saint of Ireland, that I have an opportunity to make my first speech in the Halls of Congress. It surely quickens the imagination and the pulse of an Irishman to be able to get up here and talk on the subject of peace that was so close to the heart and to the affections of that great Irishman whose memory we celebrate tomorrow. It is equally fitting that we get an opportunity in this forum to talk about a subject that is so close to the hearts and to the affection of not only the American people but the people throughout the whole world.

I am sorry my time does not permit me to go down the roll and tell you how much I appreciate the well thought out remarks of the individuals who have preceded me here today. But it is fitting, apart from that, that the young Democrats of this Congress should feel that they would like to come back here and to tell not only the United States but to tell the world that, sure, they are freshmen, but they are fresh in the sense that they represent the collective feeling of the people whose votes sent them here to the Capitol and they did that no later than on November 2 of 1954. The people all over the United States want peace. They are tired; they are discouraged; they are not interested in anything but the brotherhood of man, and that universal feeling represents the hopes and longings of the whole world. With the ground right under us now trembling from all of those recent atomic assaults and tests in Nevada, it is about time that a new generation with a new look add its little bit to retelling the age-old story that men everywhere believe in fellowship, in brotherhood, in peace under God.

Mr. Speaker, nothing that I say here today should be construed as an admission that I want to be soft against atheistic communism. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I hate communism in all of its aspects. No psychological or philosophical definition, no matter how wide the genus or the specific difference might be, could ever be large or big enough to encompass me within the dimensions of atheistic communism, because communism thwarts the very notion of the dignity of man. It tears down that rational note or aspect that identifies him as a human being. It is in contradistinction to the very position that we take here today. Our position is that the freshman Congressman came here to the Capitol at the beginning of the new session charged with the responsibility of helping to clarify, at least, a foreign policy which had contained in the immediate past a number of divergent, disconnected, and disorganized interpretations of our position and policy.

Let me say at the outset that I, for one, do not want to be guilty of the offense of the oversimplification of foreign policy. When the vote on the Formosa resolution came to the floor, fortified by the representations that it was a peace measure, we had to show a solid front and give testimony to all the world and thus exemplify our unanimity of action. We approved that momentous piece of legislation. We knew we had to draw the line somewhere, and we were very happy to do that, and we did it categorically and we did it without equivocation; yes, we did it almost unanimously. But we are standing here today talking in a nobler and a bigger sense; not in a military sense but in a political sense. I think people everywhere are interested in the brotherhood of man. I think if they are given an opportunity, they will assert and reassert that feeling, that longing, and that hunger, and I would submit that no amount of negotiation is too much, no amount of deprecation can stand in the way of trying and trying again to work out some formula that will let people of all nations, all colors and faiths, live in concert, in harmony, and in peace, because if you do not do that in this race of armaments, you are going to have nothing but total annihilation. Total victory is a myth. In the old days wartime objectives were generally limited and practical ones. It was common to measure the success of your military operations by the extent to which they brought you closer to your military objectives. But when your objectives are moral and ideological ones and run to changing the attitudes and the traditions of an entire people or the personality of a regime, then victory is probably something not to be achieved by military means or, indeed, in any short space of time at all, and perhaps that is a source of our confusion.

In any case I think there is no more dangerous delusion, none that has done us a greater disservice in the past or threatens to do us a greater disservice in

the future, than the concept of total victory.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that everything that has been said here is testimony against the recognition of Red China. To our way of thinking, Red China was branded an aggressor in North Korea. That stigma, that indictment, still stands today, and the young Democrats are not in favor of letting Red China shoot its way into the society of nations. We expect that Red China, if and when it is ever permitted membership in that august society of nations, will demonstrate not only that it had the votes of the people but it had something that is more important even than that; that it has a de jure government and as a de jure government it has responsibilities so that it can go into the council of nations, so that it can participate in the council of nations, so that it can accept and have a part of the sanctions that are imposed by that responsible society.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be a Member of this House, and I am very happy to be a member of that group who once again asks you and pleads with you to try to do everything possible in both an economic and in a political sense in the interest of peace. We admit we are doing almost everything we can, in a military sense. In our dealings with all nations, it will mean that we must have the modesty to admit that our own national interest is all that we are really capable of knowing and understanding, and the courage to recognize that if our purposes and undertakings here at home are decent ones, unsullied by arrogance or hostility toward other people or delusions of superiority, then the pursuit of our national interest can never fail to be conducive to a better world. Then, by our own conduct, we will be telling the sad and the lonely of the world of the love that is theirs to be, and by the cross of Christ and His passion and the might that is born in brotherhood and unity we will be showing the world that we are doing more than merely paying lip service to an empty ideal—that we are, in fact, trying to live in the community of nations under God.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and to the others who have spoken here today. I have been deeply moved.

The significance of this memorable and historic debate I know will be grasped by the American people. We are living nervously not on a keg of dynamite, as was expressed in earlier times, but upon a vast concentration of the product of atomic energy. For generation after generation the challenge has been to the youth of each succeeding generation to find the way to permanent peace. Each generation, one after the other, has failed to meet the challenge. To this generation again has been given the challenge. If again there is failure to meet the challenge, we have reached the end of our present civilization. Everything man has built in the long stretch of years that has perfected our present civilization will go down in ruinous debris. Then mankind will have to begin again the long and tortuous climb of the centuries from the caves to a new civilization.

In such a period of crisis, involving the endurance not alone of one nation but of all civilization, there have come to this Congress some new faces. That is always the case. Each Congress as each high school and each university has a freshman class. We on the Democratic side are happy indeed because of the quality in ability, in character and in earnest sincerity of the new Democratic members.

They have come fresh from the people. They know, as do all of us older in service in this Chamber, that what the American people and indeed the peoples of all the world most want is security against war and security against poverty. When you remove from this old world of ours poverty you have brought to all mankind the certainty of a continuing peace.

The significance of this memorable and historic debate of today is that the freshman Democratic Members of this body are not contenting themselves by remaining silent and inactive when the whole world is resting on a concentration of atomic energy power needing only the winking of an eye to set it ablast. They may not have the perfect blueprint. I do not think that anyone has a perfect blueprint. But that blueprint will be found in the common sense of the American people when the thinking of men and women in the homes of the Nation are kindled and inspired by such debates as we have been listening to today.

I have been thrilled. I have been heartened, too. In my youth I dreamed of a world of peace. The war of the North and South then was thought to have been the last war in which our people would be engaged. By 1898 the American people were so convinced that never again would there be war that the Army was reduced to a thin blue line of 25,000 men. Then out of the clouds came the war with Spain. A brief interlude of peace, then World War I, another brief interlude of peace and World War II, the most devastating war of all history.

Thinking of my boyhood dreams of a world of peace, and of the 50 years of bitter wars that have followed, I could be disillusioned. I could say as these years of the evening wrapped themselves around me that though there were rainbows in the sky there were thunderbolts and lightning in the making behind the rainbows. But I have no such disillusionment. As I have a firm and abiding faith that there is a God in Heaven, so do I have the faith that in the minds of men the purpose of that God is being implanted and that the way to the permanent peace soon and in this generation will be found. The gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues in the Democratic freshman class of this 84th Congress today have given substance to that faith.

Mr. Speaker, I could not close without an especial reference to a colleague from Chicago. Today I listened to the closing oration in this memorable and historic debate, and when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] had ended I joined with all other Members present in the round of applause that appropriately marked the delivery of one of the great maiden speeches in the history of this House.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I do not concur in all the things that have been said this afternoon by the gentlemen from Wisconsin and Illinois and New Jersey, and the others who have preceded me. But I do appreciate their enthusiastic and energetic approach to a plan for a peaceful world to which these gentlemen have subscribed. I want to say that there are great areas for agreement available to all Members of the Congress. The debate that has taken place this afternoon has indeed been refreshing. It has been one of the most worthwhile afternoons that I have spent on the floor of this Congress.

I have sat here day after day and patiently listened; I have listened for hour after hour to tedious eulogies of Congressmen who were and no longer are. I spent, I believe, a portion of one day listening to a eulogy of the groundhog from Pennsylvania. Entire sessions of this Congress have been consumed in a mutual interchange of birthday greetings. We have spent more time debating the service of food and the quality of the food in the Capitol cafeteria and restaurant than we did in toto on the Formosa resolution.

As a Member of this Congress I feel that this afternoon's beginning—and I hope it is just a beginning—will afford every Member—every new Member particularly—of this Congress an opportunity to take a more active part in the determination of the foreign policy of this country. This afternoon has been well spent and I hope that it has given every Member of this Congress an opportunity to recheck his own thinking on the foreign policy of our Government.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject just discussed.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ALBERT, Mr. TUMULTY was granted an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the fact that tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day gives me the right to disagree with both sides. I would not have risen except that the implication was that we

wise freshmen have risen up in our sophistication before we have learned the rules of the House, to put the world in order.

However, I would like to say that I cannot agree with this resolution. I think it is well intended and I think the people who are behind it are sincere, but I cannot agree with it because, in the first place, the gist of its practicality depends on the acquiescence of the Soviet Union. And if we have learned anything in the past 10 or 15 years it is that we know that we can have absolutely no further hope that those infamous men, those intrinsically evil men, guided by their black philosophy, will do anything other than promote their own selfish interests.

As to the resolution:

No. 1, we are told in this resolution—and I quote from page 4:

When we—

Meaning the United States—

side with the colonial against the anticolonial countries in the U. N., we lose the respect of half the world struggling to be free.

Why is it that our sincerity must always be questioned by our own people? In the first place, one of the greatest examples of fair treatment—of a country that came into control of another country in international affairs—was that of our country's giving the Philippines its independence. That is a specific country. There we did not join with the procolonial philosophy. That statement in the resolution is not true. As a matter of fact, our country was the first nation of the world ever to treat a conquered people in the fashion which it did, when it liberated the Philippines. We must not forget the wonderful treatment that we, under General MacArthur, afforded defeated Japan. So we are not siding with the colonial people. But if the argument is that we should side against every colonial power in the world as the resolution implies then we would have to destroy every one of our allies to accomplish that purpose.

Secondly, I would like to point out that we are asked to tell these nations who are meeting in Bandung that if they will do certain things we will give them money.

That is what it boils down to. They will take our money, but all of us know you can give money to gain friends, but they do not necessarily have to stay with you. Many a man has lost a political election who gave money to his friends. They put it in their pockets and then voted against him. There is no guaranty of the practicality in this measure.

But beyond that, and I read right from this document itself, it says:

To the people of Europe, we say this. Western German rearmament is underway, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain—

As if she ever carried out any bargain since she was first created—

—by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany; a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the U. N.

But I ask who sits on the United Nations Security Council? The Soviet Union. All it has to do to kill it, this bold new plan, is to veto it. What did you do to these countries when you put them under Stalin and company in the United Nations?

Finally, after having decided to support President Eisenhower in the defense of Formosa, we in the Congress are now told that we must throw Free China out, though we are with them as allies; and we are now going to put a United Nations trusteeship in place of our allies. There will be elections in Formosa, they say. But we rejoin, What about elections in Red China? What about elections in Poland? What about elections in the states of the Soviet Union? What about our going into the United Nations and out-Malik-ing Malik, and getting it through that the United Nations throw Red Poland out? They have no right to be there. I am sick and tired of seeing us treat murderers as if they were decent, honest people. When we begin to treat them for what they are, we may begin to save ourselves.

It is a beautiful and wonderful idea on paper. They propose, if it can only work, if the Soviet Union in its benignancy, in its known "generosity" stops drinking blood from a skull long enough to say, "We will withdraw from Poland," and then we will create this new nation with no arms except United Nations arms. We know what happened in Korea. That will be 90 percent American arms. That is what it means. So we will have to send a greater army to central Europe and a greater army to protect Formosa. That is what this proposal means. Any time the Soviet Union wants to stir herself, all she has to do is set her armies on the march, and these countries under the U. N. trusteeship would be crushed.

I am a freshman Congressman. All I know and what I have learned about governmental affairs is this, that when you are in a power game you cannot stop power with platitudes. You cannot stop Soviet commissars by sending them copies of the Declaration of Independence or DeTocqueville's book on America. We know what they are. How long can we pretend that they are any different than they are? They are the ones that put this country into the cold war.

I took some notes on the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin as he spoke. I am sure he did not mean them in any but a proper manner. He said, "Let us get ourselves in a good moral position." Let us get ourselves in a good moral position for whom? The bandits of the world? That is just like saying to the victim of a burglar, "Let's be nice to the burglar. After all, he's in our home. We must be polite to him. Let him turn on the TV. We will tie Grandma up in the closet, and give him a copy of the writings of Socrates, Aristotle, and Thomas Jefferson. It will win him over eventually"—if we live long enough and have enough people in the family.

All I say is, It is a swell idea but it will not win the hot war and it will not win the cold war. I do not even think it will change the Speaker or the majority leader.

I would like to ask our Republican friends this: "When are you going to have Henry Lodge, our Ambassador to the United Nations, do something about Poland?" I recall the great speech he made. He wound up saying, "Polanis restituta"—Poland must be restored. But Soviet oppressors of Poland are in the United Nations now. A simple resolution to put Poland out of the United Nations would give us a chance to bring about debate and put them on the defensive for a change.

So once again, let me conclude by thanking the lovely lady, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], for permitting me to have a few minutes before her time. I am glad my colleagues brought this subject up, but since tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day I do not agree with you—and besides you did not put Ireland in your resolution anyhow.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess at this point until 3 p. m.

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess until 3 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock p. m.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Arends	Fine	McConnell
Barden	Fisher	McDowell
Barrett	Forand	Macdonald
Bell	Fountain	Madden
Bentley	Granahan	Mason
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gray	Miller, Md.
Bonner	Green, Pa.	Moulder
Boykin	Hand	O'Brien, Ill.
Brownson	Harrison, Va.	Patman
Buckley	Herlong	Pillion
Byrne, Pa.	Hillings	Powell
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Holtzman	Rivers
Chatham	Jackson	Roberts
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Sheehan
Chiperfield	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Christopher	Kearns	Short
Cole	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Udall
Dies	King, Calif.	Velde
Dingell	Kirwan	Whitten
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Winstead
Eberharter	Knutson	Young
Fallon	Latham	Zelenko
	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members on the part of the House, to escort our distinguished visitor to the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, the following occurred:

VISIT OF RIGHT HONORABLE ROBERT GORDON MENZIES

The Doorkeeper announced the Right Honorable Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. Menzies, escorted by the committee of Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it is my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to be able to present the representative of a great and a proud people of a free Commonwealth, the Prime Minister of Australia. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. MENZIES. Mr. Speaker, it is almost 5 years since I last stood in this place. I shall never forget it. I was escorted in by four powerful-looking Members. There were a lot of lights burning. People were taking pictures and making television. I had gone to great pains to make a few intelligible remarks. I put them down and I found I could not see them. I looked around. I knew there were Members here because I could hear them—but I could not see them. And, apart from my memories, the only souvenir I have is a photograph which shows me leaning forward with my eyes shut and Speaker RAYBURN leaning back with his eyes shut. [Laughter.]

But, sir, I would not have you think that that was the only memory I really carried away with me because a parliamentary assemblage has one supreme honor within its gift and that is to invite some representative of another country to be present, to which honor you, with infinite courtesy in this somewhat silent land, add the privilege of making a speech, which I am bound to tell you is something we have so far resisted in Australia. But for a representative of Australia to be here twice is a remarkable experience, and I welcome it because for the second time I can perform my true function in this place, and that is the function of speaking as the head of the Government of Australia to a nation which stands so high in the good will and the understanding and the memories of the Australian people.

I am, sir, within the limits of my capacity, a constant exponent of the need for personal contact among peoples of the world, particularly among those who have responsibility. Therefore, I recall with great pleasure the visit of more than one Member of this House and of the Senate to Australia. So much is that the case that this afternoon I have had the fascinating experience of being able to greet quite a few well-known men in this place on terms of old friendship established in my own country.

I very well remember that before the war it was possible to encounter somebody in the United States who did not know where Australia was. A gentleman in San Francisco once assured me that he understood quite plainly it was on the east coast of the United States; a sort of off-shore island. But those days have gone. The war did many terrible things, and it created dangers which have not yet passed, but it did some wonderful things. I do not think anybody will ever be able to estimate the impact upon the Australian mind, and if I may say so, upon yours, of the existence in and around Australia for a long period of time of hundreds of thousands of young Americans. So that wherever we in my party go in the United States now we are bound to meet somebody who says: "I was out there with you," or: "My son was out there with you," or: "My nephew," or as the case may be. And this, I believe, has created a distinctive degree of understanding which, as far as I am concerned, always makes it so easy to get along with the people with whom I have to conduct discussions in the United States. In fact, I regret to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it makes me feel so much at home that I am liable to speak too long when I am on my feet among people whom I feel to be my friends.

It is a very good thing, sir, if I might engage in a small homily, which is an ill reward for your kindness, it is a very good thing to make new friends in the world, and we must never regard the list as exhausted. We must never give up hope that in time to come we will have reached to the true heart of people who are now unavailable to us through some form of dictatorship, and that we may find some friendship with them. The search for new friends must always go on. But it is just as important to remember that old friends must be kept, and that old friends can easily be lost in this world by neglect or by indifference, by misunderstanding. Our opponent in the world understands that to perfection, and he devotes the bulk of his time in propaganda, in seeking to divide us, seeking to set up points of argument, seeking to establish some misunderstanding and every now and then some hostility between the people of the United States and the people of the British Commonwealth. We must constantly be on our guard against it. I have, and you have, from time to time, in this great country of yours read things so violently antagonistic to the British that I could not conceive that anybody except a Communist imperialist could get any pleasure out of it. I have in London, or elsewhere, occasionally read tirades about the Americans, and I have had exactly the same feeling. Of course we are grownup people. We are adult nations. You are more adult than we are, because we are not so far along the journey of a developing nation. But we are grownup people, and we can afford in the context of our common freedom and our common understanding to discuss, to argue, to persuade, and refute. All of the things that you can engage in in this House, you engage in under the common enveloping garment of a free democracy, of a free parliamentary system.

It is because of that very freedom, because we take our freedom as a whole for granted in our own countries that we are able to engage in disputes and arguments to our hearts' content. But we know, do we not, that if it comes to the point, all arguments are forgotten. The one thing that comes uppermost is the pride that we have in being one free people in a country of which we are all proud. [Applause.]

I would like to think, sir, that that spirit could pervade the whole of the free world. I would like to feel that in Canberra we could argue with Washington—and we are a fairly argumentative crowd at Canberra—that we could argue with Washington just as London could argue with Washington, just as we could all go on arguing with each other, not as if we were liable to become enemies, but on the footing that our friendship is indestructible and we may, therefore, speak frankly—with affectionate frankness—to each other. When that happens and the whole world knows that the people of the free world are not so easily put asunder by Communist propaganda, I believe that will be the most powerful deterrent weapon that the world will have produced, because the enemy is hoping all the time to divide us.

As I have just had the honor to say in another place, we know, do we not, that should this world pass down once more into the valley of a world war, we know, do we not, that we are all together in it.

Does anybody suppose that in such a catastrophe America would go one way and Australia another? Or Great Britain one way and America another? Not for one moment.

If there is one thing of which I have the most complete assurance in my heart and mind it is that in the supreme test we will be found together, just as surely, sir, as American and Australian troops were found together on the Kokoda trail. [Applause.]

If we remember that truth, that end truth, that ultimate truth, which is therefore the dominating truth of our relationship we then merely behave like intelligent men and women. If we determine that as we shall be together in that event, we shall practice being together every month and every year as time goes on, we shall learn more and more to understand each other, and the funny little differences that exist between us. May I, before I resume my seat, sir, mention one thing only? It is worth mentioning. In the United States you have as the head of the Government the President. The President, I admit,

is not without political problems from time to time, but the President is President for 4 years; and whatever arguments may go on somewhere or other, he is President for 4 years, and, therefore, he has a fixed term and, therefore, a degree of executive authority which no Prime Minister of Australia could possibly aspire to have because the Prime Minister of Australia, I regret to tell you, is not elected for any term of office at all; he is here today and he might be gone tomorrow. It might happen.

These things have been known to happen in the past, oddly enough. Therefore, under our system of government, whatever a Prime Minister does must, in the first place, be intimately discussed with his colleagues in cabinet. He is not to commit the government to a view which he does not know he can sustain in his own cabinet. And his cabinet is not going to commit itself to a view that it does not believe it can carry through parliament. Therefore we tend to make all our policies by private discussion in the first place, and we produce the chicken fully fledged from the egg in due course. Sometimes it survives and sometimes it does not. Whereas in the United States of America, because of your system, there is a constant hammering out of public policy in committees and in Congress frequently before the point has been reached at which the policy is crystallized. I am not quarreling with your method. I see great advantages in it and some disadvantages. But what I am pointing out is that these are vastly different methods and that unless we understand the other man's method we may easily misunderstand the significance of something that is going on. Somebody reads a speech made in this House or in the Senate, somebody in Britain, somebody in Australia, and says: "I see that American opinion is so and so." But it may not be. [Applause.]

Sir, I have detained the House and trespassed on your patience long enough. I said something about winning new friends, something about the great glories of old friends. I am rather happy to think that I am making my bow to you in this place today as a young friend who happens to be the child of an old friend. I am not at all sure that the children of our old friends are not the most attractive of all. [Applause; the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the Prime Minister will be glad to stand in the well of the House and greet the Members.

The Prime Minister of Australia stood in the well of the House and received Members of the House of Representatives.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings that took place during the recess be made a part of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there will come up for consideration the donor property bill, in which many Members are interested, and in which there is tremendous interest throughout the country on the part of colleges, universities, and other schools, and hospitals. I do not believe there is any opposition to it, none that I know of, and I am the author of the bill and the chairman of the subcommittee that considered it. It was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Government Operations.

On Friday the supplemental appropriations bill will be taken up.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. A good many Members are going to Aberdeen for some demonstrations the Army is putting on. Will there be apt to be a rollcall on Friday that the gentleman knows about?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of no opposition to the second supplemental appropriation bill. There is no policy on the part of the leadership on our side, and I am sure none on the gentleman's side, to ask for a rollcall. However, one cannot guarantee that there will be no rollcall, if a quorum is not present and someone at the proper time makes a point of order.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I point out that in the full Committee on Appropriations consideration of the Supplemental Appropriations bill on yesterday no controversy arose with regard to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the exception should occur, which I hope it will not, I do not feel that I would be justified in putting over until Tuesday a rollcall on that bill.

STREAMLINE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO HELP SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of H. R. 3322 may seem to be obscured by technicalities, a conflict between law and regulation needs to be resolved. Under one accounting concept, that of the comptroller of the Department of Defense, surplus property that is capitalized into a stock fund, is not subject to donation.

As a result, the original intent of the Congress to help educational and public-health services, has been thwarted.

The Department of Defense normally disposes of 90 percent of all excess property.

Under regulation 7420.1 and in order to maintain the capitalization at the highest possible level, the Department of Defense has sold a considerable amount of such property during the last year, often and understandably, for scrap prices. An estimated $2 billion worth of property, at acquisition cost, will be sold this year.

Much of this, which would be useful, and needed by educational and public-health institutions, is being diverted to private and sometimes speculative channels.

On the other hand, the Comptroller General of the United States has stated, as of March 3, 1955, that authority to donate property to beneficiary institutions under H. R. 3322 is also authority for responsible officials to take acounting credit to the extent of the impairment to the capitalization caused by the donation.

This, coupled with provisions to insure cooperation, compliance, and control, should speed up the orderly disposal of all surplus property.

Under the donable property program we want to see real and personal property that is no longer needed by the Federal Government transferred to nonprofit groups that will best serve the taxpayers and the public interest.

For too many years, our educational and public-health institutions have had to defer their needs because of the prior claims of the Federal Government on revenues and materials, primarily for national defense.

Our human resources have suffered accordingly.

It is only right and proper that the surplus property of the Federal Government should now be channeled to schools and hospitals and related nonprofit institutions, to repair deficiences caused in part by the sacrifices we have previously asked of them.

Education and health go hand in hand to form the sturdy citizens who are this Nation's first line of defense.

This will clarify the situation and will make certain that the surplus property, paid for by the taxpayers, will revert to the use of public welfare agencies and will not be sold at giveaway prices to postwar profiteers.

Beneficial institutions can use much of this equipment in its original form. Many other items, considered as being strictly of a military nature, may be modified, converted, or cannibalized to high utility for educational and public health purposes.

The Committee on Government Operations received testimony showing that property is sometimes downgraded to come within the classification of scrap

and salvage when it might, in fact, be used elsewhere in the Federal Government or perhaps made available for use in educational and public health institutions.

Within my own experience, as one Member of the Congress, I have had schools, and old folks, and small hospitals, plead for some of this surplus property so that they could continue their good work without operating at a loss.

They could not understand how the Federal Government, as the custodian of property bought by the taxpayers' money, could permit surplus inventories to be bought dirt cheap by private operators who then proceeded to sell them back to the taxpayers at a considerable profit.

The present bill, enacted into law and conscientiously supervised, should correct these abuses.

It will also eliminate the technical roadblocks that have prevented some Government agencies from carrying out the full intent of the Congress.

The greatest good for the greatest number requires that surplus property of the United States shall be donated to eligible schools and hospitals in order to promote the public welfare and to strengthen the confidence of all citizens in the integrity of our Government.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4259) entitled "An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. OSTERTAG) and to include editorials.

Mr. DONDERO and to include an article.

Mr. CEDERBERG and to include a statement by the Postmaster General.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TUCK regarding a bill he introduced today.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matters.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. REES of Kansas) on account of important business for the remainder of the week.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 942. An act to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (a 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 17, 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:

551. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 41st Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations during the calendar year 1954; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

552. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal National Mortgage Association for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841). (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

553. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month of January 1955, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

554. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees," for the fiscal year 1955, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

555. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Federal Facilities Corporation on Tin Operations for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 125, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

556. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

557. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended, in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States by including probation officers of United States district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

558. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, relative to calling attention to a problem which has arisen which reads as follows: "1071. Gain from sale or exchange to effectuate policies of Federal Communications Commission," pursuant to section 1071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. House Resolution 92. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 91; without amendment (Rept. No. 210). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 117. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pursuant to House Resolution 105; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. S. 913. An act to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet, "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?"; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a report on the Prayer Room established in the Capitol; with

amendment (Rept. No. 214). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Committee on Government Operations on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs; with amendment (Rept. No. 215). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 93. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 216). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 217). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 177. Resolution authorizing additional copies of hearings entitled "Volume I of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1956"; without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 219). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 4534. A bill to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts; without amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 179. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3322, 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2839. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4356. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4644. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). 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. 4977. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State- or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 4978. A bill to increase the penalties applicable to individuals convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4979. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to, technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4980. A bill to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood control projects by local interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 4981. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 4982. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4983. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4984. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 4985. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4986. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State- or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4987. A bill to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4988. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State- or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4989. A bill to amend the tobacco-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4990. A bill to amend the tobacco-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4991. 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. KING of California:

H. R. 4992. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the gain from the sale of a residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4993. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to business property situated in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 4994. 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. METCALF:

H. R. 4995. A bill to preserve the wheat acreage history of farms voluntarily underplanting their allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 4996. A bill to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4997. A bill to amend the Missing Persons Act to provide that premiums paid on insurance issued on the life of a person which are unearned by reason of being for a period subsequent to the date of death of such person shall be paid to the beneficiaries of such insurance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4998. A bill to amend section 202 (7) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4999. A bill to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5000. A bill to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 5001. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5002. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered the adopted child of a deceased individual where such individual, before his death, had filed an appropriate petition for the adoption of such child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 5003. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the base year for determining any quota shall be 1950, to provide for the pooling of unused quota numbers for use in oversubscribed areas, and to provide that nations within the Asia-Pacific triangle shall be allocated quota numbers in the same manner as in the case of other nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5004. A bill to protect the rights of veterans of World War II in the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5005. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 5006. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State- or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 5007. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that the district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain civil actions only if the amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, and to provide that their jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship shall not extend to actions in which corporations are parties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5008. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that silk fabrics shall be exempt from duty when imported by certain religious societies for use in the manufacture of clerical vestments, robes, and altar cloths; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5009. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State- or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in certain elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution requesting observance of National Mental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution requesting observance of National Mental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, the South Dakota State Senate memorializing the Corps of Engineers and the Congress of the United States relative to the land-acquisition program in the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada requesting the Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary to assure adequate care and maintenance and needed expansion of national forest recreational areas in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada requesting the Congress to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes, and to authorize disposition to political subdivisions; to the Committee on Government Operation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to enact legislation to encourage local and State development of small irrigation and reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appoint a committee to investigate and study the proposed closing of Camp Kilmer and to defer closing of this military establishment until completion of such investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. 5010. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schaffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5011. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresia Handler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5012. A bill for the relief of Carlo Mattiazzi and Constanza Mattiazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 5013. A bill for the relief of Chai Ho Min, Kyuiyung Na Min, Yoo Ra Min, and Wha Ra Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5014. A bill for the relief of Jerzy George Birnbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 5015. A bill for the relief of Oscar L. McCallen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5016. A bill for the relief of Catarina Begovic (Sister Laureta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 5017. A bill for the relief of Ann Herbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 5018. A bill for the relief of Leonard Giziski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 5019. A bill for the relief of Mary Prem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 5020. A bill for the relief of Olga Bartley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 5021. A bill for the relief of Harriet L. Barchet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5022. A bill for the relief of Rachel Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5023. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to hear and determine the claims of the Aetna Insurance Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 5024. A bill for the relief of Dr. Piero Gasparri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Gordon Seymour Peter Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of Darinka Gavrilovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 5027. A bill for the relief of Robert N. Humason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5028. A bill for the relief of Wellington D. Louis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 5029. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Luther, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Renato Noe and Angela Noe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news items and editorial comment from the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., a daily newspaper which is widely circulated. It is edited by Mr. Jack Foster, who has distinguished himself in the field of journalism.

The items are:

First. A Black Day for Reclamation, which is made up of two parts: (A) The Colorado Story, by Mr. James Daniel, Washington correspondent for the Rocky Mountain News, and other Scripps-Howard papers, and formerly city editor of the Washington Daily News; (B) the California Story, which is a United Press dispatch that does not carry a byline. Both items are datelined Washington, March 10.

Second. An Associated Press dispatch, datelined Washington, March 10, headlined "Let's Not Be Stiff-Necked," and expresses a statement attributed to California's attorney general, Edmund G. (Pat) Brown.

Third. An editorial entitled "Hysterical Sharpshooting: It Can Kill Reclamation," from the Rocky Mountain News of March 12, written by Mr. Foster.

I commend the reading of these items to my colleagues in the Congress.

While I cannot endorse all that former Commissioner Straus is reported to have said, he does furnish material for serious reflection. I challenge immediately any inference that the Republicans are out to destroy reclamation, and I point out that, as these items show, reclamation projects proposed by the Administration have been stopped not by party rivalry, but by sectional disagreements and misunderstanding.

It might be pointed out to Mr. Straus that perhaps much of the unwillingness on the part of the Congress to embark on further reclamation projects now is caused by suspicion created in many minds by the past handling of projects already authorized. Congress should not, and will not, in my opinion, vote a blank check for any purpose.

But the record of the Congress is clear as to their intention to further reclamation projects found necessary to the utilization of natural resources and the creating of necessary power for development. There are many of us here today, and there have been many Members in past sessions of the Congress, who believe and have fought for the principle that it is not a governmental sin for the United States to sell power to tax-paying entities, individual or corporate, so that

legitimate business enterprises might merchandise the energy to the consumer, as well as bear the cost of distribution and services.

The President made it very clear in his state of the Union message, on January 6 of this year, when he elaborated on the principle of partnership when he said:

This policy of partnership and cooperation is producing good results, most immediately noticeable in respect to water resources. First, it has encouraged local public bodies and private citizens to plan their own power sources. Increasing numbers of applications to the Federal Power Commission to conduct surveys and prepare plans for power development, notably in the Columbia River Basin, are evidence of local response.

Second, the Federal Government and local and private organizations have been encouraged to coordinate their developments. This is important because Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a small fraction of the Nation's power needs. Such partnership projects as Priest Rapids in Washington, the Coosa River development in Alabama, and Markham Ferry in Oklahoma already have the approval of the Congress. This year justifiable projects of a similar nature will again have administration support.

Third, the Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.

The budget recommends funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to start five irrigation and water-supply projects.

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

A BLACK DAY FOR RECLAMATION—QUARRELING MAY WRECK ALL RIVER PROJECTS

(By James Daniel)

THE COLORADO STORY

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Michael W. Straus, the Democrats' controversial Reclamation Commissioner, Thursday pleaded for unity of the eastern and western slopes of Colorado and of the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River.

Mike Straus, a storm center in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, who was often accused of trying to build a Federal empire with his reclamation projects, said present disunity is destroying the West.

"The reclamation program is being liquidated," he said.

"Reclamation has never gone forward as a whole except with a united West supporting it.

"When you engage in hysterical sharpshooting, as the eastern and western slopes and the upper and lower basin States are doing, reclamation stops.

"The upper States and California, too, have not got a single new project, and they won't get one as long as they engage in political war under the disguise of talking about confused water rights."

Mike was interviewed outside the House Interior Committee hearings on the upper basin bill project, at which he has been an occasional, unhappy spectator.

Digs at Ike

"I recommend the upper basin project," he said.

Good Democrat that he is, Mike put in his digs aplenty at the Eisenhower administration.

He said that the White House is for the upper basin bill only because it senses that a day of reckoning is at hand. The West, he said, is waking up to the fact that no new starts have been made in reclamation under the Republicans.

"They're just carrying forward what they found started when they came in. In the 8 years before 1953 the average national expenditure for reclamation was $300 million a year. Since then it has been around $150 million a year.

Getting backlash

"The Republicans are now getting the political backlash of this from the West, which believes in and to my way of thinking must have these resources development projects.

"Half a century of reclamation experience is being liquidated."

To the private power industry, Mike Straus was a particular affliction. Thursday in discussing the gloomy prospects for the $1.5 billion upper basin development plan on account of sectional quarrels, Mike gave the private power group another twist.

Law is nullified

"The reclamation law is a public power law. That is written into it. Everybody knows that it is a public power law and has to be.

"The present administration disbelieves in public power and considers it creeping socialism and has so said in many instances.

"The law isn't being repealed. It is just being nullified."

As long as those in the West who realize the harm disunity is doing "sit on their can and do nothing," Mike said, "you can't blame Congress for not passing anything."

THE CALIFORNIA STORY

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Chairman CLAIR ENGLE, of the House Interior Committee, Thursday warned opponents of the upper Colorado River project their tactics could bring to an end all reclamation in the West.

The California Democrat spoke out during subcommittee hearings on the proposed billion-dollar power and irrigation project in five Western States.

He objected particularly to a leaflet—Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON, Republican, of Utah, called it a propaganda sheet—claiming taxpayers will have to put up $5,000 for each acre of land to be irrigated by the project.

Told by DAWSON that the leaflet was prepared and distributed by the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles, ENGLE replied:

"As a Californian, I vigorously disapprove of it."

Unity progress

Meanwhile Attorney General Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, of California, said he had made progress in his efforts to unify the fight against the upper Colorado project. He ended a 4-day visit after conferring with the California congressional delegation and Government officials.

Dawson produced the leaffet during cross-examination of Wilbur A. Dexheimer, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, and O. E. Larson, regional commissioner from Denver.

Dawson called the $5,000 figure fantastic. He asked if Dexheimer had any idea how the association arrived at the figure.

The Commissioner said he could not understand either the association's method or logic.

The leaflet, printed in red and white, noted in big red type:

"See what this will cost. It's your money."

Typical propaganda

Representative A. L. MILLER (Republican, Nebraska) said it was "typical of the propaganda being put out that reclamation is bleeding the country white."

Turning to Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR (Republican, Pennsylvania), a leader in the fight against the Colorado project, MILLER added:

"We spent $7,245,000,000 on flood control up to 1952 and flood control doesn't pay back one cent of interest, even in Pennsylvania * * * without the reclamation projects in the West, many easterners would be starving to death because we could not have produced the food."

ENGLE said he thought MILLER's remarks were excellent, and added some of his own.

In the past 5 years, he said, the Nation has spent as much in Europe under the Marshall plan as has been invested in reclamation in the last half century.

No returns

In contrast to the reclamation projects which returned money from their power features, he said, the Treasury did not get back "one plugged nickel" from the money it poured into Europe.

Waving an arm in the direction of DAWSON and the leaflet, ENGLE said people who sponsor that kind of thinking are endangering the whole reclamation program and could bring an end to all reclamation in the West.

LET'S NOT BE STIFF-NECKED

WASHINGTON, March 10.—California's Attorney General, Edmund G. (Pat) Brown expressed apprehension over the opposition of southern California interests to the upper Colorado project.

Brown told a news conference he is a little afraid if we take too stiff-necked attitude it may prejudice our own projects.

The attorney general came to Washington to discuss water development problems with Members of Congress.

Brown said he was told by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, that if California continues opposition to the upper Colorado development there will not be another project started in California so long as he remains chairman of the Senate Reclamation Subcommittee.

Brown said he plans to discuss the matter with Gov. Goodwin J. Knight upon his return to California.

He said he plans to review the status of Northcutt Ely, Washington attorney who is acting as a special assistant California attorney general and attorney for the Colorado River Board, a southern California group.

The attorney general said there has been a question as to whether Ely, who is opposing the upper Colorado project before congressional committees, should be speaking for the whole State or for the Colorado River Board only.

Brown also said he will press for early decision by the Supreme Court in the Arizona-California dispute over Colorado River water rights.

HYSTERICAL SHARPSHOOTING: IT CAN KILL RECLAMATION

The future of Federal reclamation—and with it development of the West—hangs in the balance.

Immediately at issue is the great upper Colorado Basin development project, logical and orderly outgrowth of the river development which began with the Colorado River Compact more than 30 years ago.

Disunity in the West itself is giving opponents of reclamation a field day.

Hysterical sharpshooting, Michael Straus, former reclamation Commissioner, had called it.

Disunity in Colorado, pitting western slope against eastern slope in a senseless quarrel over division of water resources, is a factor.

Disunity in the river basin, pitting upper basin against lower basin in a senseless quarrel over water resources, is another factor.

Opponents of reclamation and of development of the West, especially with Federal assistance, leap with unconcealed glee into the fracases built on these disunities.

And the blunt truth is that they fly at any details—major or minor—by which they hope to throw a block against such developments as those contemplated in the life-saving upper Colorado project.

It must be remembered that the water resources in the Colorado River rise in large measure right here in Colorado, even as the reclamation works by which these and other waters are harnessed in the service of mankind are born and nurtured in the reclamation headquarters right here in Denver.

It was only logical and proper that the massive Hoover Dam and other important projects should be built in the lower basin and put to vital uses the waters allocated to that area.

There never could have been a Hoover Dam had Colorado and Wyoming and Utah and New Mexico undermined and undercut the whole idea in a rage of disunity such as has been marking the upper basin proposals.

It is crystal clear at this moment that only in unity and common purpose can the West continue to march forward.

"When you engage in hysterical sharpshooting, as the eastern and western slopes and the upper and lower basin States are doing, reclamation stops," Straus warned.

"We spent $7,245 million on flood control up to 1952 and flood control doesn't pay back 1 cent of interest—even in Pennsylvania," said Representative A. L. MILLER, Republican, Nebraska, in a barb obviously intended for Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, Pennsylvania, who has been a leader in the fight against the Colorado projects.

Even to California—bitter opponent of upper basin hopes and aspirations—the future is becoming clear.

Attorney General Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, of that State, put his finger squarely on the issue when he told a news conference in Washington this week that a "too-stiff-necked attitude" on the part of his own State may well sound the doom of further projects for California.

There is no question about that.

The mere fact that Federal assistance is necessary to carry out the gigantic reclamation projects is evidence enough that they are too big for any State—too big for any region.

The upper Colorado River Basin development is vital to the future of Colorado and the other upper basin States.

But this is just as clearly on the record: The principle involved is every bit as important to California, to Pennsylvania, and to the rest of the Nation, which also must look to flood control and to development.

The President's Proposed Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following statement made by me on America's Town Meeting of the Air on a national broadcast at Wilmington, N. C., March 13, 1955:

The United States has the world's finest road system. It consists of approximately 3 million miles of roads and streets, on which more than 58 million motor vehicles are operated. This means that we have 1 motor vehicle for every 700 feet of roadway. We have practically the same road system today that we had in 1930, when we had only half the number of vehicles on our highways. At present, we are adding 3 million cars to the highways each year. Automobiles are no longer a luxury but an absolute necessity; therefore, better roads on which the cars must travel are also an absolute necessity. Because of present congestion, it is estimated that 25 percent of the gasoline consumed in metropolitan areas is burned waiting for traffic to move.

I come from the Detroit, Mich., area—the automobile capital of the world. Naturally, the growth, use, and dependence of the American people on the motor vehicle is well known to me. Today our entire economy and way of life is patterned around our automobile.

The motor and allied industries now furnish one-seventh of our gross national product. We must find a way to finance additional adequate highways to accommodate the increased use of motor vehicles and increase in population, or this one-seventh contribution will decrease.

The all-important question is how to finance a greatly expanded highway program. The highway user now pays the bill. That the American people are willing to pay the extra expense for a good road and an adequate road is evidenced by the fact that people are using toll roads in ever-increasing number. Road building is expensive. There are two ways in which we can pay for roads. First, pay as you go—that is the method we are now using. The other—to use credit financing. The latter method is simply buying something we need and paying for it on the installment plan. This applies in large measure to the sale of automobiles, of which 1 in every 3 Americans is now the owner.

One of the methods of credit financing can be illustrated by the toll roads. The other is for some level of Government to use the income from the use of highways to secure service borrowings to build the needed improvement for highways and pay for it as it is being used. Such income is the tax on gasoline, oil, and excise taxes. A bill, H. R. 4261, introduced by me, proposes to make use of the latter type of financing at the Federal level. This will encourage and speed the construction of the interstate highway system, estimated to cost $27 billion, and which system is proposed to become the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. This system of nearly 40,000 miles of roads represents only 1.2 percent of the total roads and streets of the Nation, but carries 20 percent of all rural traffic and connects 90 percent of our cities having a population of 50,000 or more. The proposal is to build this interstate system over a period of 10 years, and to make such system adequate for traffic over the next 30 years.

The proposal to borrow $21 to $27 billion to construct the interstate system and to issue bonds to run 30 years has caused some concern as to whether or not such a program is feasible and practical. However, we are now paying more car insurance than we are paying for construction of highways, and it should be noted that 38,000 people lost their lives in traffic accidents last year and nearly $4 billion was lost in property damage through accidents on our highways. When these facts are taken into consideration, I believe we could well save, in the long run, in addition to the excessive operating costs occasioned by present conditions, by going into debt for improved and safer highways.

The $11 or $12 billion in interest which would accumulate over the 30-year period amounts to less than one-fourth of a cent per mile of travel by the average vehicle, and the savings in having this new type of road system would amount to at least 1 cent a mile in operating costs alone. When we understand this situation, I think it can be plainly seen that the American people would gain by financing our much-needed highway system.

The balance of the $101 billion estimate of highway needs set forth in the Clay report is for financing accumulated and accruing deficiencies on our other roads and streets during the next 10 years, and represents the type of construction expenditure which should be paid for as we go.

In my bill, H. R. 4261, Federal funds are provided to those systems at the same level as provided in the Federal Highway Act of 1954, and the bill provides for paying the Federal share of these classes of roads from current revenues on a pay-as-you-go basis. In my opinion, this is the only way by which this Nation will ever connect its population centers by a modern and safe nationwide system of highways and have it done within a reasonable period of time. I am certain that when our people understand this program, which is designed for their convenience, their comfort, and their safety, and when they realize the savings on these modern highways, they will decide to provide for these roads and this highway system, and we will all enjoy the satisfaction of seeing a new era in road building in this Nation, which will be the greatest since the invention of the automobile.

"The easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place" has always been and always will be one of the three essentials "which make a nation great and strong."

Our Strength for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Arthur Radford, United States Navy, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, delivered the following address, March 15, 1955, before the Committee of One Hundred, Miami Beach, Fla.:

OUR STRENGTH FOR DEFENSE

In spite of widespread gloomy forebodings which have been expressed so often, I believe that world events have been steadily forcing America into a position of greater strength. Our defensive capabilities now are greater than ever before.

One matter of greatest importance, forcing us into this stronger position of which I speak, is the nature of the Communist threat against us. That there is need for continuing vigilance and military readiness on our part is readily apparent from a glance at the world situation. Almost every week there is fresh evidence of the unchanged fundamental objective of the Kremlin.

From the military viewpoint, there seems little reason to doubt the magnitude of Communist military capabilities in terms of manpower, weapons, and fighting qualities. Particularly have they been making great strides in the development of their air forces and nuclear weapons.

This in no way, however, describes the full scope of the Communist threat. The struggle is not one of military power only. In many respects, the other more sinister and devious techniques in the political, economic, scientific, and psychological fields of human endeavor are more dangerous. Such techniques include war by propaganda and subversion, by proxy, and by infiltration.

And, those techniques have been supported by the largest, most callous military power in the world. Communist military strength has given impact to infiltration and subversion, terrifying into submission those who lacked the strength and the will to resist. The capture of satellite countries, the dragging of whole nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, the maintenance of puppet regimes, and the high degree of Soviet influence in world affairs—all have been made possible in great measure by Soviet military power.

Usually down through history, we have had a reasonably clear understanding of an enemy's capabilities, but a less clear understanding of his intentions.

Today the easiest question to answer concerns Soviet long-range intentions. Here it is abundantly clear that Moscow schemes to create one Communist world with all that it means—one giant Red World Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a clear and flat assessment of Communist intentions. It is a total menace.

And with Red China, there is a parallel. Red China wants one completely Red Asia—one which includes Formosa and the Pescadores. They have so stated—not once, but many times. This, too, is a clear statement of Communists' intentions.

But Communist short-range intentions are not always so clear. In fact, they are subject to quite a bit of change. They are flexible and often fitted to the particular opposition they expect to encounter.

Right now, our eyes are focused a good deal of the time on the tensions around Formosa and off the China coast. But this is an old familiar pattern. In the past, in similar fashion, our eyes have been focused on other sensitive areas—areas like Czechoslovakia, Greece, Berlin, Iran, Korea, and Indochina—usually quite cleverly—first one and then another.

The result is that, today, the creeping expansion of communism backed by guns and bombs and several millions of troops—unrestrained by solemn agreement, or moral restraint—is a long-term challenge to everyone of us.

Accordingly, the bonds with our allies are being strengthened—in NATO, in the London and Paris Accords, in the Manila and Rio Pacts, and in our mutual defense treaties. These bonds reflect our concern for Soviet military capabilities. More than 40 free nations, including our own, have allied themselves in regional defense arrangements.

I think we all know the basic policy of the United States. Our object is peace, not war. We want a real and lasting peace, and we are working for it. No country has demonstrated more restraint or more sincere willingness to explore, discuss, and study possible courses of action to prevent war from starting than has the United States.

Until the Communists emphasize by deeds and actions, and not just by words and promises, that they really believe in peace, too, then we have no alternative but to keep ourselves strong and in a high state of preparedness.

Now, I do not hold with those persons who contend war is inevitable, or that it is instinctive to mankind. If we despair in the hope of averting war, we could become accessories in the events that lead to another.

Nor do I hold with those who think war can be prevented simply by the renunciation of war on the part of those of us who hate it.

In fact, there is little to choose between those who would transform the world into warlike garrison states and those who would put all their trust in the semantics of peace. Both are unwitting apostles of war. Historically their divergent paths have led again and again to disaster.

Our best assurance against the inevitability of another war being forced upon us lies in the collective combination of free nations always working for peace, but maintaining constantly a strong defensive posture. That calls for allied unity, firm resolution, and a willingness to make sacrifices and share in the risks.

So there may be no misunderstanding I want to make it clear that while the Joint Chiefs of Staff are charged with giving military advice on national security matters, and for preparing plans for war in whatever form it might take, our fundamental objective is to discourage war and to maintain national security. Our efforts are aimed at making military aggression so prohibitive that no one logically can choose it as a course of action.

Reality requires us to face the Communist threat. There are no real grounds for believing that the threat has materially diminished. War could come almost any place any time. It could be a big war or a limited war. It could be initiated secretly by a small handful of men whose only allegiance is to themselves—men who are contemptuous of religion and who owe no accounting to world opinion.

Under such circumstances, it is my earnest conviction that the President has asked for the proper security program, one in which the dangers we face are reduced to an acceptable degree.

In general terms, the President has recommended a defense structure which will serve the needs of national security over an indefinite period. He has suggested an Armed Forces strength on the order of 2,850,000 at an annual budget cost of approximately $34 billion. Within this framework, he has put emphasis on the development and maintenance of those forces and facilities for which the United States, uniquely among free nations, is best suited.

The proposed strength levels are based upon world conditions as they are now. They are based on the improved military preparedness of other free countries of the world, the end of active fighting in Korea and Indochina, improved weapons systems, better utilization of manpower, expected improvements in the future, the continuing Communist threat, and a whole host of other factors.

At this point I would like to interpose a few words about figures. In determining our required force levels, there are naturally a number of intangibles with which planners must reckon. One of the greatest intangibles is just exactly where, when, or how the next shooting war might be forced upon us.

If we knew we were going to face a major onslaught in the next 6 months, then we would need additional manpower and appropriations.

On the other hand, if we were guaranteed that we were not going to be forced into a war for the next 20–25 years, then I would say our force levels could be reduced.

But, of course, we cannot guarantee such a course of events and therefore must be prepared for the possibility of war. Of one thing we can be certain: The provision of adequate military strength is indispensable to our future safety.

Moreover, it is imperative that from here on out, our country have a defense program that is reasonably stable—one that is not materially disturbed by every hot and cold effort of an unfriendly nation, or wishful thinking on the part of ourselves or a friendly nation.

Large upswings or downswings in force levels have disastrous effects upon our defense planning, just as they do on business. The services have been plagued over the years by sharp inclines and declines where we increase in size rapidly and tremendously, and then decrease even more rapidly. Not only has it been wasteful but it also has involved serious risks which militarily, I do not believe we can afford to take at this time.

The stability in overall numbers is, of course, only the first step. Our next step must be to achieve stability of personnel within these numbers. It is not good enough to level off at 2,850,000 if we continue to have an inordinate personnel turnover rate. For this reason, several measures now before the Congress—measures like the proposed Career Incentive Act—are designed to induce larger numbers of qualified officers and men to accept and want the service as a career.

As a matter of fact, the stability in all the Armed Forces—stability which is being made possible by the President's program—is probably the most important single defense policy we want to see adopted. It will permit planning, orderly procurement, and efficient operation. It will give us a defensive posture which will be readily appreciated and understood by the rest of the world.

And, should important changes in the world situation make it necessary, the Joint Chiefs of Staff would step forward with recommended changes in our force levels. You can count on that.

Let me list for you just a few of the key strengths which go into the makeup of our defense program.

First. We have a strong retaliatory capability, and we are going to keep it strong. We have a long-range Strategic Air Command without peer in the world, and carrier task forces unmatched by any other nation. Our country is particularly well suited for providing these two vital elements of the free world's capacity to counter an aggression.

Second. We have strong land, sea, and air forces which can be used in a variey of situations whenever and wherever required.

I have often pointed out that we are not placing undue reliance upon any one weapon, or one service, nor are we anticipating just one kind of war. We have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending upon what the target requires. We have naval forces which can clear the sea lanes, and Army forces which can do their part toward the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have armored, airborne, amphibious, and other modern forces, all of which are important to our national defense.

In fact, the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful—the most potent—forces, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war.

In this connection, the proposed National Reserve plan will go a long way toward helping to provide the right structure for building an adequate Reserve strength to complement and reinforce our forces in being.

Third. We have allies. Collectively, our allies are stronger than ever. United States Armed Forces are a part of the allied team. It is not easy for any single nation to match the power that can be marshaled by Communists and their resources. Therefore, we have to think of using our power in a way and in the place which will provide maximum safety to free nations as a whole.

To meet local aggressions, a growing reliance can be placed on those allied forces now being strengthened in many areas of the world. At the same time, we stand ready with our forces to continue military assistance and cooperation with our friends. Thus, within limits, the pattern of our own forces conforms to that of a member in several great alliances.

Fourth. We are continuing to improve our continental defense system. Due to the nature of the Communist beast, and due to the destructiveness of modern weapons now available to the Communist bloc, the United States could be seriously damaged by sudden attacks upon us.

Therefore, we have been hard at work, in conjunction with our Canadian friends to the north, pushing the program with all practicable speed at a rate consistent with

our developing technology. We will continue to improve our air defenses, and our radar, communications, and computing systems which will provide increased effectiveness against attack. Both Canada and the United States are making invaluable contributions to this important undertaking.

Fifth. We have an industry-science-military team which, in my opinion, presents an unbeatable combination. In my present position, I derive a great personal satisfaction from this teamwork, and the national strength which it builds.

The threat of modern war calls for constant modernization. Because of their complexity, the time taken to put newer weapons systems through the various stages of research and development into production tends to be longer than in the past. Here science and industry give us a big hand.

Today, the services are organized to utilize our national scientific, technological, and productive abilities. Science helps us to devise new weapons and new techniques. Industry helps us to get them. In this endeavor, we are very much in need of your continued teamwork.

With all that we have, we cannot let ourselves become complacent, or tend to rest upon past laurels. We need to remain steadfast and determined that our weapons systems will be kept ahead of our competitors. It is vital to our security and world peace that we do so.

In this, you and I are partners in defense. Our product is national security.

Gentlemen, those are some of our more important military strengths. We can review this defensive power we have with mixed feelings. We can derive satisfaction and confidence from its built-in strengths to protect our way of life. We can also be sobered by the contemplation of modern weapons systems in the hands of a callous and ruthless enemy in the years which lie ahead.

Yes, there are inescapable difficulties and dangers posed by Communist powers whose aims and policies are so diametrically opposed to our own. In a lawless world, we must be prepared for a fight at any time—and we must be prepared with weapons and other means better than those which are likely to be used against us.

Thus, our Armed Forces today are situated in many parts of the world, representing the strength of this Nation in defense of human justice and freedom. Our capabilities serve to prevent war through their deterrent effect. They are also the foundations of an effective defense if the aggressors should strike.

In essence our Armed Forces are geared to the preservation of our way of life. We must never forget that our most precious possessions are the lives of our citizens and the principles for which they stand.

In my judgment we have an adequate, properly proportioned defense program—one in which you can place your confidence. We have a good strong defense team. We can and will continue to improve it. And in all cases you can count on our Armed Forces team to carry out their tasks and missions with skill, determination, and a complete loyalty to the American people.

Radio Station KSCO, Santa Cruz, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of Tuesday, March 8, fire completely destroyed the transmitting equipment of radio station KSCO in Santa Cruz, Calif. Every electrical circuit was rendered useless. Control panels, transformers, tubes, indeed, the entire complicated technical apparatus was burned to charred junk. Yet, within little more than 48 hours—in spite of the remoteness of this station from normal replacement supply sources—KSCO was back on the air to serve the public.

I believe that this is gratifying proof of the individual recovery potential in the face of sudden disaster. KSCO happens to be a regional key station in the CONELRAD setup, which is needed in times of war emergency. In spite of almost total destruction, the station managed to get back on the air with makeshift equipment, some of it flown in from as far as 3,000 miles away, in just 2 days.

Manager C. V. Berlin and his staff should be congratulated for proving that even grave disaster cannot for long keep us down, as long as the will is there to overcome it with all we have.

Those U. N. Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the question was raised in this body earlier this week as to what funds were used by the United Nations to pay indemnities, amounting to approximately $180,000, to a group of former American employees of the U. N. who were fired after they invoked the fifth amendment on questions concerning their loyalty to the United States.

I have made a rather extensive investigation of this matter, Mr. Speaker, not only to determine how and why these awards were made, but also to determine how they were paid and whether the indemnities would be regarded by the Internal Revenue Service as damages, in which case they would be tax free, or as income, in which case they would be taxable. Finally, I made inquiries to determine whether, if the indemnities were regarded as income, the United Nations would then pay the State and Federal taxes due on them. As members of this body know, United States employees of the U. N. are reimbursed for all income taxes they pay to the United States Government, and to the New York State government, so that, for all practical purposes, their salaries are tax free. In lieu of taxes to our own Government, however, they contribute to the U. N. Staff Assessment Fund, and it was from this fund that these awards were paid. Since the awards range from $6,000 to $40,000, the State and Federal taxes on them would be substantial. My inquiries have established, in brief, that first, the Internal Revenue Service has held that the awards are income, and therefore taxable; and secondly, that the United Nations will not pay the taxes thereon.

I should like to add this further word, Mr. Speaker: In my judgment, the disposition of these loyalty cases constitutes a shabby blot on the U. N. escutcheon. In firing, and then rewarding these individuals, the U. N. pursued completely contradictory courses. It could not have been right on both counts. Either these people were loyal, in which case a great injustice has been done to them; or they were disloyal, in which case they should never have received these handsome indemnities.

The size of the awards is, of course, unimportant. The principles involved go to the very foundations of our concepts of equity and justice.

I am certain the Members of this body will be interested in the exchange of correspondence I have had on this matter with our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and with Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews, of the Internal Revenue Service. It is appended herewith:

DECEMBER 6, 1954.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Ambassador to the United Nations, New York, N. Y.

DEAR CABOT: I note in the press that our Government has agreed to pay the awards made by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal to 11 United States citizens who were former employees, and that the awards will be paid from the staff assessment fund. This letter is to request further data with respect to this matter; namely, (1) a copy of the statement made by Senator FULBRIGHT agreeing to the awards; (2) a copy of the resolution jointly sponsored by the United States and Argentina with respect to the creation of a board of judicial review, with, presumably, appellate jurisdiction over the Administrative Tribunal; (3) a report on the status of the resolution and the steps through which it will have to pass before such a board is actually established; (4) data about the staff assessment fund—what it is; who contributes to it; how contributions are made; is it voluntary or compulsory; and what the fund is used for. The press reports that the fund is a United Nations tax levied on all employees' salaries in lieu of the national income taxes, and that the special indemnity fund is to be carved out of this, and maintained at a level of $250,000. Have the U. N. employees agreed to this, and if so, what contingencies other than the dismissal of the 11 Americans have persuaded them to the creation and maintenance of such a fund? Finally, I should be grateful for a clarification of the tax status of U. N. employees, vis-a-vis their respective countries. It was my understanding that their income taxes were remitted to them by the U. N., but the press reference to U. N. taxes in lieu of national income taxes raises some question in my mind about the status of these employees.

This is rather a large order, but I know you agree that the matter is rather far-reaching in its implications, and I am therefore anxious to secure as much data as possible with respect to it.

With kindest personal regards to your good self, I am

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Member of Congress.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 22, 1954.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR HAROLD: This is in further reply to your letter of December 6 concerning the United Nations Administrative Tribunal awards question which was before the United Nations General Assembly.

Final action on the matter was completed by the General Assembly at its closing plenary session on December 17, and I am now in a position to give you a full report on it.

The resolution passed by the Assembly on this matter on December 17 (copy enclosed) represents the culmination of vigorous efforts made in compliance with House Concurrent Resolution 262, which (a) called upon the United States delegation to "take all possible steps to prevent the General Assembly of the United Nations from authorizing or approving the payment" of awards made 2 years ago to 11 Americans, and (b) provided that the United States "should not be compelled to contribute any of its funds" in payment of these awards and "that no part of the funds heretofore appropriated, or hereafter appropriated by the Congress for the United Nations shall be used for the payment of such awards."

The record is clear that all possible steps were taken within existing legal procedures to prevent the payment of these awards. These steps commenced, of course, long before the passage of the House concurrent resolution. The United States delegation fought against the payment of the awards throughout the eighth session of the General Assembly. The State Department's Legal Adviser fought before the International Court of Justice to establish the legal right of the Assembly to refuse to pay the awards. Finally, after the International Court denied that right in its opinion of July 13, 1954, so that payment became inevitable, the United States delegation to the ninth session of the Assembly continued to maintain the position that the awards were unjust and indeed outrageous and that the opinion of the International Court of Justice, though it should be respected, was erroneous.

Thus, all possible means of opposition to the awards—except outright defiance of the opinion of the International Court—were used in a fight carried on over 2 years. Outright defiance of the opinion of the International Court would clearly have left the United States standing almost alone on the issue and would have resulted in the payment of the awards from appropriated funds contrary to the intent of the House concurrent resolution.

With reference to that intent, the majority leader of the Senate speaking on August 20, 1954, said that the resolution "does not go to the point that United Nations funds from other sources should not be used for such payment of damages, but that funds appropriated by the American Congress, from the American taxpayers, should not be used in this particular type of situation."

Accordingly, the United States delegation, having exhausted all efforts to defeat payment of the awards completely, made certain that the awards would not be financed from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated by the Congress. It saw to it that a special fund was set up financed from staff assessment—the internal United Nations tax on its employees—from which past and future awards would be paid. The creation of this fund was bitterly attacked by the Soviet bloc, which alone opposed it in the plenary session.

The United States delegation then went further—beyond the directive of the House resolution—to assure that in the future the administrative tribunal would not have the last word in making awards such as those made to the 11 Americans. It carried on a long and difficult, but finally successful, fight to establish the principle that awards of the tribunal should be subject to judicial review. Though this principle was defeated in committee, it finally won acceptance in the plenary, and action to establish the review procedure will be taken by the next session of the Assembly after thorough study is given to the matter by a special committee. Of course, the United States will be represented on this committee.

The General Assembly resolution of December 17 as a whole—including the establishment of the special fund and the provisions for judicial review—represents a real victory for the United States and a defeat for the Soviet bloc. The resolution as a whole was approved 52 to 5, with only the Soviet bloc opposed.

An important element in this victory was the fact that the United States was able to make clear its opposition to the opinion of the International Court of Justice and at the same time avoid the necessity of insisting that the Assembly disregard it. As you know, one of our strongest weapons in exploiting Soviet propaganda and motives is, from time to time, to challenge them to submit specific issues to the International Court for decision. Their inability to accept such a challenge constantly exposes to the world the true nature of their charges and actions. Had we not been able to secure the adoption of the resolution of December 17 and had we found it necessary to insist that the Assembly refuse to comply with the opinion of the Court, we would have lost this very important weapon against the Soviets.

Now, let me reply to your requests for specific data:

(1) I am enclosing copies of three statements made by Senator FULBRIGHT on this matter. The first was made in committee on December 3, when the original United States-Argentine resolution was introduced. The second was made in committee on December 9 after the committee voted to accept an amendment to the United States cosponsored resolution which struck out the acceptance of the principle of judicial review. The third was made in the plenary on December 17 in support of the United States cosponsored amendment to restore the judicial review principle. This amendment carried and is embodied in the final resolution.

Also enclosed is a copy of the statement made by Senator SMITH on December 9 in support of the United States cosponsored resolution.

(2) I am enclosing copies of the original United States-Argentine proposal (A/C.5/L. 317), the resolution adopted by the committee on December 16, and the resolution voted by the plenary on December 17.

(3) I have already covered the question of the status of the resolution. The steps provided for the creation of the judicial review machinery are spelled out in the resolution of December 17.

(4) The provisions for the creation of a new special indemnity fund from staff assessment proceeds are contained in part "C" of the enclosed resolution of December 17.

The staff assessment fund is derived from an internal income tax levied by the United Nations on its employees. Payment of the assessment is compulsory. The plan was adopted some years ago by the Assembly for two reasons. The first was to avoid the inequality of take-home pay of Secretariat employees which would result if they were subject to varying systems of national income taxation. To meet this situation, it was recommended to governments that they exempt their citizens employed by the United Nations from national taxation; and, in anticipation that this would be done, it was provided that there be substituted an internal income tax applying equally to all Secretariat employees. The second reason for the establishment of a staff assessment plan was the recognition that it was undesirable for United Nations employees to be a tax-free group of individuals, a situation which would result if they were exempted from national taxation.

The proceeds of staff assessment have been treated as miscellaneous income of the Organization and are at the disposal of the General Assembly to meet expenses of the Organization. Thus, the consent of the staff is not required. The Secretary General has proposed for study by member governments a plan whereby staff assessment proceeds would be placed in a special fund from which credits would be given only to those governments which have exempted their citizens from national taxation.

Of the governments whose nationals are employed by the United Nations within the boundaries of their home countries, the United States is the only one which has failed to provide exemption from national taxation. To avoid a situation in which Americans employed by the United Nations would be subject to double taxation—staff assessment plus United States income tax—the United Nations has each year reimbursed to these Americans the income tax paid by them to the United States. Other member governments have, of course, been most unhappy about this situation because it has resulted in their contributing to the payment of United States income taxes. It is for this reason that the Secretary General has made the proposal mentioned above concerning the handling of staff assessment proceeds in the future.

I hope I have covered all the various questions you had in mind. If not, please do not hesitate to call upon me for further information.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Representative to the United Nations.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: This is in reply to your letter of January 5, 1955, in which you request information concerning the treatment, for Federal income tax purposes, of amounts approved by the United Nations General Assembly for payment to a group of 11 Americans whose employment with the United Nations was terminated after they refused to answer questions concerning their loyalty.

Information available to us indicates that in each case a claim was presented for salary, remedial relief, and reimbursement of legal costs. In making the awards consideration was given to the extent to which each applicant had expectation of continued employment by taking into account the terms and nature of the contract of employment and evaluating the applicant's chances of earning a livelihood after separation from the United Nations.

Section 61 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides a general definition of gross income which states that except as otherwise provided in the Internal Revenue Code, gross income means all income from whatever source derived, including, but not limited to, compensation for services, fees, commissions, and similar items. Section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 was to the same effect.

It is our opinion that the awards are compensatory in nature and that the amount thereof, in each case, is includible in the gross income of the recipient for the year in which such amount was received.

The legal fees expended by each of the individuals concerned are deductible in the year in which such fees are paid in accordance with the provisions of section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 23 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Very truly yours,

T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 14, 1955.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives.

DEAR HAROLD: Thank you for your letter of February 9 and the enclosure.

I have looked into the question which you raise and can assure you that the United Nations will not pay the Federal income tax on the awards.

With best wishes and kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Representative to the United Nations.

Farmers and Small Business Would Be Hurt Under New Hoover Commission Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to commend and congratulate the gentleman from California, Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD, for the splendid work he has performed as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, generally known as the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOLIFIELD has contributed much to the public good by his alertness as a member of this Commission. I am confident that many of the reports from the Commission are in better form today as a result of the work of Mr. Holifield. I am certain that the public has been served well by Mr. HOLIFIELD's determination to keep them informed as to the contents of the reports and as to their effect on the various segments of our economy.

The farmers of America and small business of America owe to Congressman HOLIFIELD a great debt of gratitude for his efforts in the past few days to make public, through his dissenting report, on the most recent of the Commission's activity calling for the reorganization of Government lending agencies. Congressman HOLIFIELD points out, effectively, how many of these recommendations will hurt the farmers and small businesses throughout the country. He has been consistent in calling to the attention of the American public the fact that the new Hoover Commission has gone beyond the scope intended by Congress and has taken to itself the role of policymaker, usurping the power of Congress. Congressman HOLIFIELD points out that if Congress should accept the Hoover Commission's recommendations on Government lending agencies we would, in effect, approve a new policy to enforce tighter agricultural credit, tighter credits on housing loans and small-business loans, and enforce restrictions on the rural-electrification program.

All of these seem to me to be a backdoor approach toward eliminating Government cooperation in programs assisting farmers, small business, and home owners. Add to these, thousands of veterans who would be unfavorably affected by other reports from the Hoover Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include, herewith, an article on this subject, written by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star March 15, 1955:

THE NEW HOOVER COMMISSION: HOLIFIELD POINTS OUT THAT REPORT CRITICAL OF AID TO FARMERS, SMALL BUSINESSMEN DIDN'T NOTE SUBSIDIES TO INDUSTRY

An open secret around here is the way ex-President Herbert Hoover is seeking to change basic and long-established Government policies through the medium of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which he is chairman.

To any one familiar with Government agencies and their operations, this is made clear enough in the Commission's latest report to Congress this week which contains 48 recommendations affecting Federal lending agencies. But, to make it doubly sure that the public gets the story, it is explained at long last by a Democratic member of the Hoover Commission who also is a Member of Congress, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California.

He takes occasion to reveal what he considers a distortion of the Commission's job as laid down by Congress, about which he long has been disturbed, in the course of a minority report on Federal lending agencies in which he dissents from most of the recommendations. As he sees it, the recommendations which are designed to turn over financing now handled by many Government lending agencies to private banks, point in the direction of tighter agricultural credit, a slowing down of housing construction, restrictions on the rural electrification program and limitation on other direct or indirect aids provided by the Federal Government.

In the Truman administration, when the Commission was created and Mr. Hoover was delegated to head it, the Commission limited itself to recommendations on ways of making the Government more efficient and its operations more economical—a mechanical, reorganizing job. Mr. HOLIFIELD thus tells the story of what has happened now:

"The Congress re-created the Hoover Commission to study the present organization and operation of the executive departments and agencies, with a view to better management and economy. I do not believe that the Congress wanted advice from the Commission on public policies of every sort.

"The Commission has construed its congressional mandate otherwise. This report indicates that the Commission is willing to roam far and wide in the field of public policy.

"No matter how wise and well-informed, the 12 Commission members cannot be expected to have more than a casual acquaintance with many of the complex issues posed by this report. The task-force study contributed little, in my opinion, to the deliberations of the Commission."

It is regarded of some significance that James A. Farley, another Commission member, issued a broad, if brief, statement of dissent to proposed policy changes. Though a member of the Roosevelt cabinet, which he left when he broke with President Roosevelt over a third term, Jim Farley never was regarded as a New Dealer, but conservative of viewpoint. He said:

"It is my opinion that this report fails to give adequate reasons for recommending changes in certain Government organizations, functions, and policies which have served a good purpose, especially in fields where private enterprise has failed to meet the needs. I refer particularly to the Farmers' Home Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Export-Import Bank, although there are other agencies which this report has dealt with in a similar manner."

Dissents also came from two officials high in the administration and in the President's confidence. Attorney General Brownell objected to turning over REA to private bank financing. He and Arthur S. Flemming, Director of Defense Mobilization, could not go along with cutting off normal short-term export-import loans by the Export-Import Bank, or for reducing or abandoning urban planning and reserve of planned public works by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The 10-member task force on Federal lending agencies included four bankers, and its chairman was a partner in Price Waterhouse & Co., certified public accountants—Paul Grady. Mr. HOLIFIELD thought it unfortunate that the Commission again used in the present study a "re-hash" of a report by Price Waterhouse for the first Hoover Commission that was severely criticized by important members of the previous Commission as reflecting a narrow accounting view of broad public policies.

The California Congressman also pointed out that while the Commission criticized subsidies in Government programs for farmers, homeowners, small businessmen and veterans, it said nothing about much more lavish subsidies to big manufacturers, publishing firms, ship operators, airline companies, and the like, or about "the hundreds of millions of dollars obtained by large companies as interest-free loans through the device of accelerated tax amortization." Compared with the latter, the former, he said, "pale into insignificance."

Mental Health Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1953, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce launched an investigation of the toll of all the major diseases confronting the Nation in order to determine what steps were necessary to combat them. Among the diseases studied were heart disease, cancer, infantile paralysis, tuberculosis, mental illness, and several others. Submitting its findings to Congress in March of 1954, the committee declared in its report that "there is probably no more serious problem in the health field today than that of mental illness." Permit me to cite you some of the evidence in support of this conclusion:

During the past year, some 2½ million men, women, and children were treated for some form of mental disorder in mental hospitals, at psychiatric clinics or in the offices of private psychiatrists.

On any day during the year, nearly three-fourths of a million people were under the care of mental hospitals alone—constituting more than 50 percent of the 1,400,000 patients in all

the hospitals for all diseases in the entire country. This figure for hospitalization of the mentally ill is an alltime high. It represents an increase of 60 percent in the past 20 years.

Another 5 million who went to general hospitals to get treatment for physical ailments or injuries were found to be suffering from some mental or emotional disturbance as well.

The year also saw more crimes and acts of delinquency committed than ever before—over 2 million major crimes and more than 400,000 juvenile delinquency cases.

Federal, State, and city government expenditures in connection with mental illness were over the billion mark—or about $3 million every day of the year.

The cost in human misery, wasted, and destroyed lives, cannot be estimated, nor is it possible to compute the secondary financial costs to the individual victims, their families and to the local, State, and Federal governments.

This array of shocking facts leads to the inescapable conclusion that mental illness is taking a greater toll than ever before in our history and that it is, with very little doubt, the most serious of all the health problems confronting the Nation today. The shocking nature of the picture which I have just painted for you is compounded further when we consider that the situation is the result not of inevitability but of neglect.

I would like to read to you excerpts from a statement made recently by Dr. William C. Menninger in behalf of the National Association for Mental Health. I quote:

It may come as surprise to many that mental illness has probably the highest recovery rate of any group of illnesses today. In my own State of Kansas, for example, where citizens and politicians have developed active treatment centers from what had once been merely custodial institutions, 4 of every 5 patients admitted to a mental hospital for the first time go home within a year of admission.

The basis for the erroneous impression that the majority of mentally ill patients do not get well is probably the fact that in many of our large mental institutions 60 percent of the patients who enter them never leave. How can this be so? Because Kansas and other States which are rehabilitating their mentally ill patients have invested money in trained people primarily, and buildings only secondly.

This past election American citizens voted more than $750 million to put up new mental hospital buildings to house patients who in many cases will not receive treatment because there will be no trained personnel to treat them. Each year, we build buildings and when these buildings are filled up, we build new ones. In 1903 there were 150,000 patients in our mental hospitals, today there are 700,000. As long as we continue to spend our money for buildings instead of doing research and training professional personnel to cure these patients, this trend will continue.

But, look at Kansas, as an example of the other side of the coin. In 1946, Kansas had 5,172 mental hospital beds and the United States Public Health Service estimated that it needed nearly 4,000 more. Today, the average population of Kansas' State hospitals has dropped from over 5,000 to 4,551. Yet Kansas actually admitted 75 percent more patients in 1954 than in 1946.

The buildings Kansas didn't have to build would have cost 25 to 40 million dollars, to say nothing of the cost of caring for 4,000 additional patients each year.

There is no reason that every State cannot do this. I don't mean to minimize the size of the problem. Mental illness is still the most expensive, most prevalent, and most neglected health problem in the world. But, given trained personnel and the knowledge that proceeds from research, most mental illness can be cured and, ultimately, can be prevented.

We don't have a fourth of these trained people. We spend less for research in mental illnes than we leave in tips on restaurant tables. Until all of us, as citizens, do something about this—research and the training of professional people—we will continue to build buildings to house patients we could be making well.

Dr. Menninger puts the case simply, sharply and eloquently, and he refutes once and for all any notion that may still exist to the effect that mental illness is hopeless, that nothing can or should be done about it. He places the emphasis correctly on the need for widespread public support of the organizations which are carrying on the fight against mental illness. He concludes with a plea in behalf of the National Association for Mental Health, the national citizens' organization which, together with its 400 affiliates, is leading the crusade against mental illness.

On May 1 to 7, Mental Health Week will be observed in thousands of communities throughout the country under the direction of the National Association for Mental Health and in cosponsorship with the National Institute of Mental Health of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. During Mental Health Week an attempt will be made to rally millions of Americans to the campaign against mental illness. During the balance of that month the National Association for Mental Health and its affiliates will conduct a nationwide fund-raising drive—the Mental Health Fund campaign—to raise money for research, training, improved treatment of the mentally ill, and education. To help provide the maximum success for these events—Mental Health Week and the Mental Health Fund campaign—it is my honor and pleasure to submit to this body a joint resolution calling upon the President to proclaim May 1 to 7 as Mental Health Week, to urge widespread participation in this observance, and to encourage enthusiastic financial support for the Mental Health Fund campaign. The joint resolution reads as follows:

Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and

Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental health organizations associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and

Whereas the Mental Health Fund is in dire need of public support in order to carry on research in the field of prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; sponsor training of expert personnel to staff the mental hospitals and the community mental health services; provide more adequate treatment for the mentally ill, and promote mental health education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 1 and ending May 7, 1955, as National Mental Health Week, and urging the people throughout the Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, inviting the communities of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and calling upon the public to support the Mental Health Fund.

The Navy's Career Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Navy League, at Detroit, Mich., on December 3, 1954. I believe that the Members of the Congress will find this address well worth their perusal.

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

THE NAVY'S CAREER DILEMMA

Mr. President, national officers of the Navy League, ladies, and gentlemen:

I am really glad to be here tonight. As you perhaps know, I have taken an active interest in the Navy League for many, many years, so I am personally acquainted with its officials, its program, its objectives, and its achievements. The Navy League has done a tremendous job over the past 52 years to assist and help the Navy and I can assure you that help has been appreciated.

I was particularly pleased to see the new 1954 four-way program Mr. Richards and his able program chairmen have inaugurated. This represents, I believe, the league's revitalized intention to take a more active, dynamic role in assisting the Navy and the Nation it serves. I am glad that this is so, because seldom in the league's history has there been a greater need or a greater opportunity to help the Navy than there is right now.

Several times, when I was active in Navy League affairs, the thought came to me that the Navy was sometimes remiss with regard to the potential of the Navy League, that it could and should give more guidance and encouragement to the league. So when I became Secretary of the Navy, one of my private resolves was not to neglect this vital task.

It is for this reason that I particularly welcome the chance of speaking to you tonight, and to lay before you a very important problem wherein you can do a tremendous job to help the Navy.

To begin, I'd like to read to you a letter I received just a couple of weeks ago, from the wife of one of our young bluejackets. She wrote as follows:

"SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: Thank you and the members of the United States Navy who are responsible for keeping my husband away from his family for the second year in succession. The morale of this young man could not get any lower.

"I hope you all have a very Merry Christmas.

"Very sincerely yours,
"_____ _____."

Whether she knew it or not, the young mother who wrote me this greeting hit right at the heart of a problem vital to every citizen of this country, particularly to members of the Navy League. The problem is our reducing ability at the present time to attract enough young men of the country to a career of naval service.

I wish to make it clear that this problem is common to all the services * * * Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps. All are confronted with the same dilemma: Too few present-day young Americans appear to believe that either the patriotic need or material reward is sufficient to make them willing to make military service a career.

The man of whom this young woman has written is 28 years of age, and has been in the service for 9 years. In that time, at the cost of some $9,000, the Navy has trained him to be an aviation ordnance technician with guided missile experience. His total salary is $250 a month, about $55 a week; a day laborer gets that much or more. In the last 4 years, that young sailor has seen combat duty in Korea aboard an aircraft carrier; he has served with a specialized development squadron in California; with a jet fighter squadron in various areas of the Pacific; for the past 6 months he has been attached to an aviation support squadron in the Hawaiian Islands. He has been married for 4 years, he has 1 child, and this will be his third Christmas away from his family. Are you surprised, as his wife states, that his morale is low? The important point is that when this man's contract with the Navy expires, and he is requested to reenlist for additional service, he will probably refuse to do so, as increasing thousands are doing. Instead, he will choose a civilian career and probably be paid twice as much and be able to stay at home with his young family, and the Navy will have lost another valuable, trained technician, a man we very badly want to keep, a man our country needs in uniform, a man in whom the taxpayers have invested heavily for the Nation's readiness and security.

The man represents the career dilemma that we would like for you to try and help us solve. In so doing, you will ask, why must the Navy keep this young man away from his family for 2 successive years? Why is it necessary to keep him on sea duty for such prolonged periods? Why will he probably not reenlist? What have we done and what are we doing? And finally, what else must be done about it?

To help you understand the background, you will recall that the Navy had a pre-Korean strength of 315,000 enlisted men. Three years later when the truce was signed, we had expanded this to over 700,000 men. During the past year, we have been reducing to reach an authorized strength of 608,000. This represents a 14 percent overall reduction, but will still leave us with a Navy almost twice the size of what it was before the Korean war started.

With this 14 percent reduction in numbers of men, however, there has been very little commensurate reduction in our commitments. We still have almost as many ships and squadrons in commission and deployed overseas as during the Korean campaign. In these perilous days, we must keep a fleet in the Far East, a division of Marines in Korea and one in Japan. We must keep a fleet in the Mediterranean, a force in the Persian Gulf. While these units are not actively engaged in fighting, they and all our ships must maintain a heavy training schedule in order to insure the instant readiness and vigilance which the world situation has dictated.

Complicating this reduction in strength without a concurrent reduction in operational commitments is the fact that 60 percent of the men in the Navy today have enlistment contracts which expire in the next 2 years. These personnel can be divided roughly into two groups—the so-called career people who are on their second or subsequent enlistment and the noncareer people serving on their first enlistment. Among our career personnel, only 48 percent are signing up for additional service. This 48 percent today compares with 90 percent only 1 year ago. For the noncareer people, less than 3 percent are signing up. In summary, it is alarming to note that the overall reenlistment rate has fallen from 46 percent in October 1953 to only 7 percent in October 1954.

Therefore, because an increasing number of short-term and career-type contracts are expiring and are not being renewed, plus the inevitable losses due to sickness, disability retirement, etc., the Navy estimates it will lose about 375,000 men—or 60 percent of our total strength—during the next 2 fiscal years.

The critical part of this is that not all of these losses are the apprentices and the unskilled. Many are highly trained technicians, specialists in electronics repair, aviation mechanics, submarines, and atomic weapons, as well as the many other technical trades of the Navy. Many are our key people—our supervisors, our petty officers. Visualize the effect on a major civilian industry—Detroit's automobile industry would be a good example—if it were faced with the prospect of a 60-percent turnover of its personnel in only 2 years, many of them key personnel and potential supervisors for future years. This is the problem the Navy—and indeed, all of the services—faces today.

To replace these losses, we have only two sources; first to call the Reserves to active duty—obviously impractical in peacetime. Second, to enlist and train new recruits. We are meeting increasing difficulty in doing the latter despite vigorous and increased efforts. To compensate for those leaving the service this year, we will require a total of 145,000 new recruits, or about 12,000 every month. The quota for September was 12,500, and we failed to meet it by 1,700. The quota for October was again 12,500 and we failed to meet that by 4,000. Some of this fall-off is seasonal, but it indicated our increased difficulty of replacing our losses.

Again, I would like to point out that the twin problem of enlistment and reenlistment is common to all the services. Accepting 2-year draftees in the Navy is certainly not the total or satisfactory answer, for it takes almost 3 months to put a man through basic recruit training, about 4 months more through a technical school if required. Add to this the administrative time of travel, leave, etc.; many a recruit does not reach his first duty station for about 8 to 9 months. He has had some training and indoctrination but he is still inexperienced and unfamiliar with general Navy life. This takes several months more to learn. Just as he reaches the point of becoming experienced and valuable, his 2-year draft term is completed, he leaves the service, and the process must start all over again. It is for this reason that the Navy cannot survive as a first-class fighting service if it becomes a conscript Navy. There must be a base of between 50 to 60 percent of career people. To maintain this base, not less than 25 percent of those completing their first enlistment and 75 percent of the career people must reenlist.

And what of the quality of the young men who are enlisting? Remember that our naval equipment is becoming increasingly complex and specialized, and demands high caliber personnel with special training to maintain and operate it. All of the armed services need their share of the top talent of the country, and this need becomes more pressing as our naval equipment becomes more complex. Yet of the 8,500 naval recruits who enlisted in October, 35 percent were in the lower quarter mental group. A year ago, we were taking only the required 27 percent of that low mental group. This percentage was established by the Department of Defense to fairly distribute among all the services a fair proportion of both upper and lower groups of mental talents. Now, however, instead of taking only its share of the lower mental group, the Navy is taking 8 percent more than required and is still unable to recruit numbers needed. Thus, at a time when the complexity of our modern atomic Navy is demanding increased performance and skill from the individual, the Navy is being forced to reduce its quality standards.

These facts summarize the problem today. But for the future, the prospects are even more serious as our senior supervisors—those who came into the Navy during World War II—complete their 20 years of service in 1960–65 and become eligible for retirement.

What has the Navy done and what is the Navy doing about this problem? Frankly, we have done a great many things. First of all, Admiral Carney and I are both committed to the internal improvement of the Navy—its morale, its leadership, its appearance, its discipline. Over the long pull, we know this will make the service more attractive by giving it greater esprit, which in turn will give to each individual the sense of belonging to a fine and an important organization.

Secondly, we are taking every measure to solve the problem of overcommitment—which keeps our fleets almost continuously at sea—by trying to increase the numbers of operating ships, so that each individual ship can spend more time in its home port. Take our Pacific Fleet as an example of how our far eastern commitments adversely affect the career problem. Roughly one-half of the fleet is on station in the Orient at all times, where it is obvious that around the troubled water of Korea, Indochina, and Formosa, we must keep a strong 7th Fleet. A ship in the 7th Fleet spends 6 months in the forward area, plus 1 month of turnover and transit time. So the ship can expect 7 months out of every 12 in the Orient. But even the other 5 months can't be spent in the home port area. Every time a ship returns from overseas duty, there are large numbers of men scheduled for release or for shore duty. New people must be assimilated and trained. In effect, then, much of the remaining 5 months is spent at sea getting ready to go back again.

One way to alleviate this is, of course, to have a few more ships, so that the 7-month period in the Far East could be reduced. More ships, however, mean more men and more money and neither are easy to come by. However, Admiral Carney and I are doing our utmost to solve this one. If we can, it would do a great deal toward attracting more career people.

As for the personnel situation itself, our Chief of Naval Personnel, Admiral Holloway, is working overtime to alleviate and solve this problem. He has introduced extraordinary methods giving more attention to the individual man and his problems, to reinstate some of the traditional benefits that have been taken away since World War II. He has taken drastic steps to try and maintain dependent medical care—such things as requiring shipboard doctors when they are in port to serve at the local dispensaries to provide better care for the dependents of our men at sea. He is trying to see that living conditions and housing conditions around our major bases are improved. And he has increased the size of our recruiting staffs and reemphasized our recruiting program to help sell the Navy to the youth of the country.

But all of these actions are still not solving the basic problem—of attracting more young

men to make the Navy a career. The civilians and military leaders of our Navy appreciate that with peacetime military forces of over 3 million people we cannot expect all of our personnel to be career people. We realize that a great proportion of our Navy's future enlisted strength must be noncareer, short-term personnel. But it is also true that if the Navy is to remain a first-class organization, it must have a cadre, a base, a foundation of career people.

To provide this strong base of career people, both in talent and numbers, there must be two fundamentals: Motivation by the individual and recognition by the public.

For the individual who is thinking about making the Navy a career, there must be two prime attractions—the opportunity to do something useful and worthwhile; the opportunity to improve himself and his fortunes.

For the public, there must be general and genuine recognition of the individual's worth, of his importance, of his tasks, and of his accomplishments.

Why are the Navy and the other services finding it increasingly difficult to attract young men of the country to a career in the Navy?

In the first place, military service is not sufficiently attractive, not only in the material sense, but in the sense of duty to country. Presently, the personal advantages of civilian life so outweigh those of present day military service that fewer and fewer men care to make the sacrifice. Furthermore, the material inducements which await him as a civilian veteran—education, veteran's benefits—exceed the material attractions of making the Navy a career. When you ask a man to make a career of the service today, you are asking him to spend a large share of his life away from home and family, and not always in the most desirable spots in the world. The Aleutians, the Straits of Formosa, the Persian Gulf, all may have the poster appeal of romance and adventure to an enlistee, but to an American sailor who has seen some of the world and has matured to the point of decision about his life's work, it doesn't compare with Carthage, Ill.—especially when the wife and kids are back in Carthage. This family angle is increasingly important, for more and more of our men are married, and they are getting married younger all the time. A naval career these days means many long periods at sea of intense work maintaining the readiness of our fleets. It means a change of duty station at least every 2 years with the constant turmoil of moving family and household possessions. It means low pay.

In the second place, more people are not making the Navy a career because of the apathy of the public to the value and need of the career man to the country.

Today, the one really valid argument that can be presented to our people and to the young men in the country is simply but most importantly that they are needed by the service, needed by the country.

As I see it, the problem is to create once again within the country an attitude that a career in the military service is one of the most honorable professions, worthy of the best men in the country, and vital to the peace and prosperity of the Nation. Pride in our military men, pride in the uniform they wear, pride in the service—must once again be common to every American. Service in the Navy in peacetime must be as warmly and as generally recognized as in wartime. This atmosphere must permeate the general public and be reflected in their attitude toward the serviceman and his problems, in order that the services will attract the best men. If this can be done, more of our best young men will become convinced that the country needs them, and will choose the service as a career.

If this public recognition and appreciation can be brought about, then the American people will automatically take greater care of career men and their families. If international commitments are going to demand that we keep large numbers of men overseas for long periods of time, then the answer may be to give them a little bit of America in the overseas area. This may mean housing, schools, medical care, all of which are expensive. It may mean schooling to provide the technical know-how necessary to maintain and operate our equipment. It may mean more ships in service. In short, whatever the price, we've got to pay that price to gain the caliber and numbers of career talent necessary to keep the Navy strong. Failure to do so can only result in a second-rate Navy.

Now what can the Navy League do to help us? First of all, the league can promote a continuing nationwide program of public education to inform the American people of the gravity of this problem, which as I said, is common to all the services. Second, as part of that same program, the league can initiate a campaign to sell the naval service to our patriotic young citizens as a career—a career which in truth is vital to the security and welfare of the country. That campaign must be long range, vigorously pressed through all the public media, and it must not appeal just to materialism but to service and devotion to country. If there were more appreciation and esteem by the American public for military service, more of our young people would understand our country's need of their services and would choose it as a career. As part of that campaign, I think the league should try and sell the American public that if they want a first-class Army, a first-class Navy, a first-class Air Force, and a first-class Marine Corps, they must pay the price for it.

But most of all, by that program, the league will be helping to create an atmosphere of renewed public pride in peacetime military service.

This is the challenge that I offer to you.

The Economic Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a surprising and rather wonderful thing when a congressional committee composed of both New Dealers and Old Dealers—liberals, conservatives, and ultra-conservatives—can get together unanimously on a report on the status of our economy and on the President's economic proposals.

Yet that is what happened this week when the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, composed of 7 Senators and 7 Representatives—with 4 Democrats and 3 Republicans in each group—made its annual report to Congress as required under the Employment Act of 1946, the Full Employment Act.

But before the editorialists begin to write rapturous pieces about the new atmosphere of economic unity on Capitol Hill, it might be useful to see just how we 14 committee members of such diverse personal views really managed to get together on a unanimous report on so explosive and controversial an area of national debate as economic policy.

We could agree, of course, on a wide number of fundamentals, such as all-out defense against Communist expansion, maintenance of a strong free-enterprise system, the fact that we had a recession last year but want to have prosperity from now on, and so on. As a matter of fact, there are broad areas of agreement among Democrats and Republicans on a great number of things, including virtually all basic American principles, and I think we sometimes tend to underestimate this unity on the really big things while we pay much more attention to the political fights over details.

Nevertheless, in order to achieve the goal of a unanimous report, the joint committee had to narrow down quite a bit the scope of the report, and then start refining the language. Thus, although the Democrats were inclined to say things were not nearly good enough, the Republicans wanted to point out, instead, how much better they are than they were a year ago.

The result was compromise on both sides with such language as this:

> Employment and production have regained about one-half of the ground lost, and unemployment has receded about one-third. Most indices in recent weeks have been up.

While this sort of compromise gave some substance to the idea that there is broad general agreement on many aspects of the economy, it was not satisfying to either group on the committee. So the result was that after our unanimous committee report, we then added a bunch of supplementary reports in which Democrats took a critical look at the present economy and of the President's economic proposals, while the Republicans took the opposite view—that things were pretty fine. And, of course, that was to be expected. For these divergent views are not just politics—they represent basic and fundamental differences of approach of the two political parties.

CAUTION

Throughout the report there is evidence that a good part of the present steam behind the economy comes from unusually high-volume, bunched-up automobile production. The question is asked: What happens if auto production begins to slacken later in the year, as it apparently will have to? What happens to steel, glass, rubber, and other related industries, and how do we take up the slack? In this connection, the approach taken by my public-works bill received broad support among members of the Joint Economic Committee, particularly on the Democratic side. But even the Republican members saw a need for more public-works activity, particularly in the distressed areas.

CONTRAST

While both Democrats and Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress were agreeing in principle that the Government must be prepared to take a strong hand in meeting any basic economic dislocation before it causes deep distress to the whole coun-

try, the reactivated Hoover Commission, heavily loaded with ultraconservatives, came out with a report urging elimination of many of the Government's best weapons in the economic arsenal against depression. It wants to get Government out of business so much and so badly that, if we were to follow the Hoover approach, I am afraid we would end up all over again, as we did once before under his direction, having no business at all.

Marguerite Kozen, Julius Chajes—Goodwill Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the 13th Congressional District of Michigan is proud of the singular achievements made by so many of its citizens. Mr. and Mrs. Julius Chajes, of 610 Blaine Street, Detroit, Mich., are two such persons who have added particular luster to the district through their accomplishments. Through the use of their talents, the Chajes have performed an outstanding service of goodwill for their adopted country, the United States of America—Mrs. Chajes, as an established operatic soprano, who sings under the name of Marguerite Kozen; Mr. Chajes as a composer and concert pianist.

Our Nation is justly proud of such of its citizenry who, without the honor of presidential appointment, voluntarily serve as ambassadors of goodwill, establishing and solidifying vital friendships with neighbor countries. In appreciation of these services, I ask the permission of Congress to spread upon the RECORD a résumé of the accomplishments of the Chajes that it may serve to inspire all Americans to use the talents they have in good will service to our country.

Each year, Mr. and Mrs. Chajes, who were born in Europe but came to America to flee nazism, make regular trips through Central Europe and Israel for personal appearances and radio broadcasts. It is my understanding that on such trips, they also make contributions to printed publications as a means of expressing their support of our Government's efforts to convey information and to express its good will to those areas which, for political reasons, have been blocked off from our part of the world.

Mrs. Chajes made her American debut as soloist with the New York Philharmonic in Carnegie Hall. She has sung leading roles with opera companies in the United States and abroad. During the past 7 years, she has been on 8 consecutive concert tours in London, Paris, Lausanne, Vienna, Salzburg, Rome, and Jerusalem. With her husband, she has been presented in more than 300 concerts in the United States, coast to coast, and Canada.

Julius Chajes, while best known to the world as a composer and concert pianist, is known also in the city of Detroit as a conductor and teacher. Hailed as a "wonder child," he made his debut at the age of 9 in a piano concert in Lemberg, Poland. His first string quartet was played in Vienna, when, as a 12-year-old, he appeared as composer and pianist. A student under several famous teachers, including Moritz Rosenthal, once a pupil of Liszt, Mr. Chajes also studied conducting and composition in Austria.

From 1934 to 1936, Chajes headed the piano department of the Music College of Tel Aviv, Palestine. In this country, he became a teacher of composition at the New York College of Music. In 1937, he played the premier of his second piano concerto first with the Vienna Symphony, and the following season, as soloist with the Detroit Symphony Orchestra.

On a recent trip to New York, Mr. Chajes learned that his 142d Psalm has gone into its sixth printing—said to be an almost unprecedented achievement in choral work. The setting of the psalm has been recommended by David Williams, noted organist and choral director, to a conference of 300 Protestant choir directors as one of the most significant contributions of modern times to liturgical music.

The Robert Shaw Chorale and Fred Waring singers have made extensive use of Chajes choral works in concert and on television.

In Detroit, Mr. Chajes has been director of music at the Jewish Community Center since 1940. He was cofounder and artistic director of the Detroit Friends of Opera, Inc. He is also music cochairman of the Detroit Round Table of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

We salute in gratitude Mr. and Mrs. Chajes and the many other American citizens who are using their talents to perform a vital service for their fellowmen as well as to give pleasure to them.

True Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in this week's edition of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register illustrates the frustration which the editor of that publication has had in attempting to learn from the Secretary of Defense the relative cost and capability of land-based and carrier-based aircraft in the performance of strategic bombing missions.

What every unbiased person wants to know, what every citizen has a right to know is, "Have the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group made a comparative or relative evaluation of the apparent capability of land-based aircraft and carrier task forces to carry out strategic bombing missions? If either can carry out such missions, why do we need both? And is it economical to have both, rather than the one system that can carry out the mision most effectively?" To date Secretary Wilson has ignored these and similar questions.

I worked long and hard for the Unification Act which passed this Congress in 1947. My only purpose in working for the passage of that bill was in the interest of the security of the United States at the least possible cost to the already overburdened taxpayer. Those of us on the Expenditures Committee at that time listened for days and weeks to the testimony of the best military minds in the world including General Eisenhower who testified for the bill.

We were striving to eliminate duplication, waste, and extravagance by bringing our services closer together. I think Congress today should determine whether or not the Unification Act is functioning as it should. We should find out if there is any duplication of strategic bombing assignments within the Defense Department. It was my understanding that the first supercarrier was for testing and evaluation purposes. Before we embark on an expanded carrier program I think we should have the results of this experiment in the first instance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert the editorial called "True Economy?" from the Army-Navy-Air Force Register in today's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would point out to my colleagues and emphasize to the printer that the title includes a question mark. Are we getting economy, as a result of unification, or are we building up three services, with no consideration at all for duplication, overlapping, and waste? The editorial, with questions as yet unanswered, follows:

TRUE ECONOMY?

Elsewhere in this issue, the Register prints two letters—one addressed to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson by the editor of the Register on November 30, 1954; the other, a reply, dated February 9, 1955, and signed by D. Walter Swan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Information.

It is, perhaps, significant that an inquiry concerning matters of basic policy and true economy in the military establishment was referred to a public relations assistant to answer—perhaps not. It might be significant, also, that the somewhat lengthy reply signed by Mr. Swan discusses at length what he assumed, erroneously, to be the premise of our letter, and then proceeds to a pep talk about defense programs which carefully avoids answering the questions asked. (At his news conference this week, Secretary Wilson, asked about Joint Chiefs' approval of the supercarrier, also used this technique of answering a question which had not been asked.)

On the score of Mr. Swan's apparent assumption concerning our premise, let it be said merely that responsible public officials can be "forced" to adopt a program by other means than arbitrary fiat—they not only can be, they usually are.

All of the factors cited by Mr. Swan as bearing on the maintenance of a military establishment of any given type and size are so obvious that they can be assumed to be factors considered by the responsible officials—as they were, in fact, assumed by us to be.

But this by no means answers our question as to whether or not "consideration has been given to any factors other than the application of monetary limitations, to the present structure and assigned missions of the forces."

Nor does the balance of Mr. Swan's letter answer the more specific questions any more satisfactorily. Since he failed to answer them, we will: In every case in which we asked specifically whether the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group has made a comparative or relative evaluation, the answer is a flat, "No."

WSEG has not examined weapons systems, existing or planned in the separate services, in which there is apparent overlap of function or of capability. WSEG has not made a comparative analysis of the cost or effectiveness of Army as against Air Force control of Army-type aviation. WSEG has not done an evaluation of land-based as against carrier-based long-range strategic bombardment systems. WSEG has not conducted any study to determine whether, in the light of current and expected aircraft developments, the old separation of Strategic and Tactical missions within the Air Force still makes sense. And so forth, and so forth.

The Register does not pretend to know the answers to these questions. It does assert, with complete confidence, that the answers are equally unknown to Secretary Wilson, his Deputy Secretary, and all his Assistant Secretaries. We concur heartily with Mr. Swan when he congratulates the country on having both strategic air forces and carrier task forces. But we didn't ask Mr. Wilson about "carrier task forces"—we asked him specifically about the relative cost and capability of land-based and carrier-based aircraft in the performance of those air missions which, in military parlance, are termed "strategic"; and we asked him, specifically, whether WSEG or any other Defense Department (not Navy or Air Force) agency had tried to find out whether, as regards the carrier task force, "the addition to it of strategic bombardment capabilities increases its size and cost beyond those which would be required for naval forces not concerned with strategic bombardment."

The answer, of course, is "No"—neither WSEG nor any other group has made such an evaluation above the single-service level.

In our issue of February 5, we printed an account of significant changes now in process to give the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group the scope that the late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal intended it to have when he set it up 6 years ago. That account contained many of the answers which did not get into the letter signed by Mr. Swan.

With the House Armed Services Committee endorsing the Navy's request for a fifth Forrestal-class carrier, and other Members of the House questioning its wisdom, it might be wise for Mr. Swan and his superiors in the Pentagon to take another look at our letter of last November and realize that what we raised in that letter was no mere problem in public relations. We asked serious questions about matters of grave public policy, and they are not answered by a polite brush-off from a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Swan says that "missions and requirements stem from national policy decisions and broad basic guidelines for planning."

Precisely. Our point is that, so far, these "broad basic guidelines" seem to be laid more up from the services to the Defense Department, than down from the Secretary of Defense on the basis of the independent evaluation, for him, of service projects and programs.

There may be no duplication, therefore, no waste, therefore no opportunity for true economy on the apparent overlap of Strategic Air Command and the employment intended for the supercarriers of the Forrestal class. There may be no duplication or overlap in the missiles systems being developed and even standardized by the three services, and so no opportunity for true economy there.

Our point is not that we don't know the answers but that the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff don't know the answers, because no qualified agency has yet conducted a scientific and objective evaluation of these and other equally important "weapons systems."

Until the Secretary knows the answers, he cannot be certain that his is a program of true economy.

A Bill To Amend Title 28, United States Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to which I would like to call particular attention because of the economy involved as well as the important bearing it has upon the administration of justice in the courts of the land. My bill raises no complex questions and is short and simple and easy to understand. It reads as follows:

A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that the district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain civil actions only if the amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, and to provide that their jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship shall not extend to actions in which corporations are parties

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1331. Federal question; amount in controversy

"The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions wherein the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $10,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and arises under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

"§ 1332. Diversity of citizenship; amount in controversy

"(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $10,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—

"(1) individuals who are citizens of different States;

"(2) individuals who are citizens of a State, and foreign states or citizens or subjects thereof;

"(3) individuals who are citizens of different States and in which foreign states or citizens or subjects thereof are additional parties.

"(b) The word 'States,' as used in this section, includes the Territories and the District of Columbia."

The effect of this proposal, if enacted into law, is to increase the original jurisdictional amount in United States district courts from $3,000 to $10,000, exclusive of interest and costs, in matters of controversy arising under the Constitution, laws and treaties of the United States, and in controversy between persons of diverse citizenship, and to confine jurisdiction in such cases to individuals who are citizens and to the exclusion of corporations except where Federal questions are raised.

This measure is designed to relieve the Federal courts of litigation of a trifling or less substantial nature and to confer jurisdiction in such cases upon the State courts where it belongs. Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress has the power within certain limitations to fix and determine the jurisdiction of the United States courts. It is my information that the jurisdictional amount was fixed originally in 1780 at $500. In 1801 it was reduced to $400, then in 1802 it was again fixed at $500. In 1887 the amount was increased to $2,000, and in 1911 it was increased to $3,000.

Since 1911 when the jurisdictional amount in controversy was last increased the value of the dollar has steadily declined and litigation has considerably multiplied, particularly in the field of damage suits. Few such suits are now brought for as small an amount as $3,000. Moreover, a greedy and Gargantuan Central Government in the last few years has usurped the powers of the States by expanding its activities into almost every phase of our existence and we can feel its tentacles in all walks of life.

This unwarranted invasion of the governmental functions and responsibilities of the States has been carried on under the guise of beneficence but if continued unchecked will finally leave the Government of the States and localities nothing more than the hollow shells of a lost liberty. Some of the States have succumbed to these spurious doctrines and have yielded to this usurpation of their powers either through a failure to understand the fundamental principles upon which our Government was established and is based, or have surrendered in the hope of receiving a liberal abundance and share of the governmental largess made available to them under many of these socialistic schemes.

My thoughts in respect to the increase in the jurisdictional amounts are not original with me for it is my understanding that a committee of judges comprising the senior United States circuit judges has recognized the desirability of making this change, and several bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives in recent years to this effect, and at least one bill has passed this body raising the jurisdictional amount from $3,000 to $7,500.

I want it distinctly understood now that I have unbounded confidence in the Federal judges presiding over the courts in which I have practiced. I am well acquainted with the United States district judges now in service in Virginia. I have the highest respect for all of them and they are, I believe, my warm personal friends. I have not discussed this subject with any of them. Hence, I have no authority and do not undertake to speak for them. Knowing them as I do, I believe that they would welcome the changes herein proposed in the interest of economy and in the administration of justice by relieving them from the bur-

den of hearing and trying cases of a frivolous or less substantial nature, thus enabling them to devote more of their valuable time to cases of greater importance. I do know that they are all men of the highest qualifications, fitness, and character, and who would not under any conditions covet influence or power. It is my desire to enhance, if practicable, the usefulness and the already high standing of these honorable courts.

Under the diversity of citizenship clause of the Constitution, the courts have from time to time over a period of some 70 or 80 years construed the word "citizen" or "citizens," as used in article III of the Constitution, to embrace corporations also. Having enunciated this doctrine they have found and held that the persons composing the corporation are presumed to be citizens of the State where the corporation was chartered, and the courts have held that this presumption is irrebuttable. While there may be substantial basis for this theory and line of reasoning, I do think the time has come to curtail the jurisdiction of Federal courts based on the citizenship of corporations. This view, likewise, is not new or original with me for attempts have been made repeatedly for the last 75 years to negate these rulings by congressional action. The House of Representatives as far back as 1880 passed a bill, H. R. 4219, 46th Congress, one paragraph of which deprives Federal courts of jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship in cases between a corporation and citizens of any State in which it does business other than patent and copyright cases. Other measures of a similar nature passed the House of Representatives from time to time thereafter but were lost in the Senate.

As late as 1932 President Hoover in a special message to Congress on strengthening the judiciary system of the country recommended that jurisdiction of Federal courts be modified by "providing that where a corporation, organized under the laws of one State, carries on business in another State, it shall be treated as a citizen of the State wherein it carries on business as respects suits brought within that State between it and residents thereof and arising out of the business carried on in such State." The effect of the Supreme Court decisions hereinabove generally referred to construing the word citizen in article III, is to confer fictitious citizenship upon corporations. The bill which I have introduced will, if passed, nullify these decisions and limit the jurisdiction to individual citizens and exclude jurisdiction where the citizens are corporate or fictitious.

Mr. Speaker, I am a firm believer in the principles of States rights, and particularly where these principles apply to litigation. These matters in dispute can be settled more expeditiously and with a closer approach to public justice in the localities where the cause of action has arisen. Our State judges as a whole are learned men. They are fair, impartial, and highly fitted to wear the judicial robes. For the most part they rank in fitness and ability on a plane equally as high as our United States district judges. Under the aegis of such a judicial system and with expansion and improvement of communications such as automobiles, airplanes, the press—including radio and television—as well as our modern and improved educational programs, I cannot believe that the people of the respective States would be so provincial in this enlightened era that they would refuse a fair trial because one of the litigants was a citizen of another State. More often than not cases are moved from the State to the Federal courts for no purpose other than to delay the trial and administration of justice, and as we all know a delay in the trial of a case often thwarts public justice.

The Congress is called upon repeatedly to create additional Federal judgeships to relieve the present judges of the existing workload which in some Federal jurisdictions is unbearable. These additional courts are created and established at great expense to the already overburdened American taxpayer and the principal parties continue to be subjected to the harassment, the inconvenience, the delay, and the expense of having their cases heard and tried in some instances at least hundreds of miles away from the scene where the cause of action arose and where the litigants, attorneys, and witnesses reside.

Briefly, the above are a few, among many other good reasons, why the original jurisdictional amount in controversy should be changed so as to curtail the jurisdiction of the United States district courts, thus leaving important legal rights of our citizens to be determined in a forum where public justice will be promoted—not retarded or denied.

It is my fervent hope that the bill which I have introduced may have the active aid and support of the members of the Judiciary Committee not only, but of all those who are interested in economy at the Federal level where it is so sorely needed, and who are interested in the preservation of the rights of the citizens of our sovereign States as well as in the fair, impartial, and speedy administration of public justice.

March 15: Hungarian Freedom Day—Statement by Congressman John Lesinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 107th anniversary of an event which brought joy and virtual independence to the people of Hungary. This was a very important event in Hungarian history, for on that day over a century ago the Hungarians regained some of the freedoms which were denied to them by their Hapsburg overlords. In the charter of freedom which the Hungarian House of Deputies approved on March 15, 1848, a number of reforms were introduced which were approved by the Austrian emperor. Among them freedom of the press was established, feudal servitude and heavy taxes on the peasantry were abolished, and the Hungarians were allowed to form their own national government. Louis Kossuth was made president. In short, by the Freedom Day Charter the Hungarians secured national autonomy, or for all practical purposes, independence.

The freedom gained in 1848 was soon lost, and it was not until the end of World War I that Hungary became a completely independent country. The Hungarians enjoyed the blessings of national independence for about two decades, but then came the dark years of World War II. Toward the end of the war Hungary was invaded by the Red army, and since then the Hungarians have been struggling, insofar as they are able, to free themselves from the clutches of their Communist rulers. The fight they are waging against the ungodly Communists is an uphill fight, one in which many brave Hungarians have been placed under arrest and are serving prison terms in convict labor camps. Even the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty, the most outspoken foe of communism in Hungary, is not free.

This prelate of the church was arrested and imprisoned by the Communist government on some trumped-up charges and has been in prison since December of 1948. The whole free world, and specially our own country, sincerely hopes to have the cardinal released from prison, and we are doing everything practicable to support the Hungarians during these painful times. We are seeking to keep up the Hungarian spirit of independence by means of messages broadcast through the Voice of America. This is one of the ways that we hope will strengthen resistance to the Communist regime and thereby keep alive the Hungarians' faith in the cause of liberty.

In the celebration of this significant day, the Hungarian freedom day, all of us ardently hope that the rebirth of a new freedom for Hungary may not be too far off.

I intend to introduce shortly a concurrent resolution whereby Congress can focus the attention of the free world upon the violations of the Yalta Agreement committed by the Soviet Union. With the weight of Congress in back of such a resolution we can provide an effective way of puncturing the hypocrisy of Soviet propaganda.

Mr. Humphrey's "Blooper"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the St.

Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Mr. Humphrey's 'Blooper'," together with a communication which I addressed to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this editorial pointing out that it was an extreme case of quoting a public official out of context.

MR. HUMPHREY'S "BLOOPER"

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, we regret to note, appears to have contracted a case of the affliction that has bothered some other officeholders before him. It is a peculiar infirmity, for which the only known specific is a dose of realism mixed with humility.

Under the spell of this strange virus, the officeholder becomes obsessed with the idea that he cannot afford to admit having made a mistake.

Secretary Humphrey seemed to have been bitten by that bug when he testified before a House committee on what some Democrats have been unkind enough to call Humphrey's "billion-dollar 'blooper'." This is a freshly discovered loophole in the administration's 1954 tax law, under which corporations can reduce their tax liability substantially by taking double deductions for certain business expenses.

The Secretary admits that the loophole exists, and he favors amendment of the law to remove it. But, like other officeholders before him, he is going through strange contortions in an effort to disclaim responsibility for the error.

"You gentlemen passed the law, we didn't," Mr. Humphrey told the Congressmen. "If you made a mistake, I'm sorry."

That was a rather ungracious remark coming from a Cabinet member who has never been modest about hailing the administration's 1954 tax law as just about the greatest work of tax architecture in history. Mr. Humphrey's experts labored for months over that tax bill. They should have been aware of any billion-dollar "bloopers" that were in it.

The congressional committees have tax experts, too. These experts also should have detected the loophole which is now belatedly discovered. But their failure does not by any means excuse the Treasury's.

Mr. Humphrey would simplify everything if he would just frankly admit that his department can make mistakes and in this case did.

MARCH 15, 1955.

EDITORS, ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH,
St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: Your editorial in Sunday, March 13, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Mr. Humphrey's 'Blooper'," is an extreme case of quoting a public official out of context to make him appear to say the exact opposite of what he did say.

I was present and participated in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee where Secretary Humphrey testified.

The full unrevised statement of the Secretary occurred in the following colloquy, page 18 of the unrevised transcript:

"Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. MILLS, I don't know what it is you are trying to drive at. You gentlemen passed the law. We did not.

"Mr. MILLS. That is the point I am driving at, Mr Secretary.

"Secretary HUMPHREY. If you made a bad error, I am just sorry. For our participation in it, I am sorry. I regret that it happened, and I am trying to correct it as quickly as possible. And I am not trying to pin it on you.

"Mr. MILLS. Mr. Secretary, my point is this, exactly the point you make. You attempt to lay the blame and the responsibility on this committee.

"Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I am not."

Prior to this point in the testimony, Secretary Humphrey had repeatedly stated that the Treasury Department had made a mistake and were partly responsible.

On page 11 of the uncorrected transcript, he stated:

"I think that it was a mistake. I think that it was a mistake that we made in the Treasury in the first instance in suggesting the matter. I think it was a mistake that you gentlemen and all of us participated in as we went along. It is one of those things that can happen, as I have said, when you are doing a job as big as this.

"We thought, and I am sure that you gentlemen thought, that all you were doing was a constructive job, as represented to us, to make the tax accounting and the business accounting coincide, which is a desirable thing if you just say it quickly."

On page 12, Secretary Humphrey further stated:

"So that is why I am here; because I think we made an error. I do not think we appreciated the results of what we said in the law. I don't think we appreciated the results of the advice that we gave you gentlemen. And I think that you gentlemen, on our advice and on your own hearings and on your own determinations, joined with us; and we just all made a mistake which ought to be corrected.

"Mr. MILLS. The error, if it was made at all, was made in the acceptance of the proposition by the Treasury and the suggestion by the Treasury that this provision be included in H. R. 8300.

"Secretary HUMPHREY. We will take our full share of responsibility for it. I think we are all involved."

It was only after Mr. MILLS of Arkansas kept trying to put the entire blame upon the Treasury Department that Mr. Humphrey made the remark you quoted out of context. The questioning and statement of Mr. MILLS were so extreme, and I thought, in error, in trying to take all blame away from the Ways and Means Committee that I entered the colloquy, page 38, to make this statement:

"Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I mainly wanted to clear the record, because I want to disassociate myself from the views of Mr. MILLS, in particular his defense of the committee. I personally am willing, as a member, to assume the responsibility, as a member of this committee, for what we did in H. R. 8300, and I would hate to see the time come when we did not, as a committee, assume responsibility for our actions.

"It is very good to inquire as to why we did certain things, to find out the course, to see where an error was made. But I, personally, think in order to assume any credit for what we did in H. R. 8300, we likewise must assume a responsibility for the harm that we have done. And I am not yet willing to say that this committee is a creature of either the executive department or political caucuses, even though there are members of the committee who seem willing not only to say it but by their actions make it a reality."

On page 92 of the transcript occurs this final colloquy, in point:

"Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't think that anybody had any idea; and I think if we had studied this provision for another year, we would still have put it in without knowing what has happened to date. It took actual application to find out.

"The CHAIRMAN (Hon. JERE COOPER, of Tennessee). I understand that. And I think you very appropriately stated here that the Treasury and you assume your part of the responsibility for the mistake that was made.

"Secretary HUMPHREY. That is right."

On Saturday, March 12, 1955, you have an editorial headed: "Now you see it, now you don't". You complain bitterly about a public relations firm quoting one of your editorials on the Dixon-Yates controversy out of context in relation to the other editorials you have printed on the subject. You conclude the editorial with the sentence, "Sweet are the uses of public relations."

Gentlemen, I think your complaint of being quoted out of context was justified. I suggest that you fight the cause of quoting out of context whenever and wherever it occurs. Also you might occasionally print the arguments on the other side of the Dixon-Yates controversy. This one-sided reporting your paper has indulged in on the Dixon-Yates and other public issues is just as reprehensible as quoting out of context and just as damaging to honest public discussion.

Yours truly,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

The Need for Improvement in the Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to provide for greater economic security for our senior citizens over the age of 60 when they reach the evening of their life.

Because of the increasing number of older people in our population, there is a growing interest in the economic and social problems which have arisen as a result of this change in the makeup of this country's population. I believe we should give more serious thought to these problems so that we can deal more adequately with the growing number of elderly people and afford them the opportunity to spend their declining years in greater comfort and fewer economic worries.

In the last few years there have been some changes in the structure of our social-security system, which has been expanded to include greater numbers of our citizens, and the benefits have been somewhat liberalized. It is my conviction, however, that we have not gone far enough. There are still some serious deficiencies which should be corrected. In many instances the benefits are far from adequate and provide only a minor part of the needed security. In other instances the age limitation is too rigid, so that many people who are in dire need of this security cannot obtain it.

My bill aims to correct some of these deficiencies by improving and increasing the social-security benefits and by decreasing the age limit so that more people would be entitled to these benefits at a time when they are most urgently in need of this assistance.

The bill which I am introducing seeks to amend title II of the Social Security Act in four major respects, namely, to increase the minimum benefits, to increase the amount of outside earnings, to reduce the retirement age at which such benefits become payable, and to extend coverage to include self-employed

professionals. Let us examine these four amendments more closely.

First. Increase in minimum benefits: The minimum monthly benefits payable under the social-security system at the present is $30. This is a most inadequate sum for an elderly person to be able to subsist on for an entire month at the current cost of living rate, especially where these people are no longer physically able to earn the limited outside income permissible under the law. Talk to any of our older citizens receiving this minimum and you will find that they are quite bitter and resentful over it. They feel that they are the forgotten people.

Consequently, I am proposing to raise the minimum monthly payments to $40, which averages at about $1.30 per day over the month—not a very large sum to cover even the most elementary needs. Nevertheless, I am certain that this small increase will be greatly appreciated by many elderly people throughout the country.

Second. Increase in the amount of outside earnings: Under our present law, those entitled to receive social-security payments are allowed to earn up to $100 per month without deduction or loss of such benefits. There are still many among our older citizens who are able to work and they desire to do so in order to maintain a greater degree of economic independence and to keep themselves productively occupied. They can still render good services for their community and for the country as a whole, and we need not deprive them of this opportunity prematurely.

Therefore, I urge that the so-called work clause in the Social Security Act be amended to allow these people to supplement their income through part-time work whereby they can earn up to $125 per month or a total of $1,500 per year, instead of $1,200 per year as at present.

Third. Lowering of retirement age: I consider this as the most important amendment proposed in my bill. A lowering in the eligibility age for entitlement to retirement benefits under social security is long overdue. Somehow, in the changes and improvements made in the law in recent years, this badly needed change was overlooked. Today, the age limit for eligibility to social-security benefits still remains at 65, and this age has become a yardstick of retirement. This causes a great hardship on many persons between the ages of 60 and 65 who are suffering from ill health and are no longer able to work and earn a livelihood.

It is particularly causing a great hardship for widows in this age group, who must wait until they reach the age of 65 before they can qualify for survivor's insurance. At the age of 60 or more women have almost no chances of obtaining any kind of employment. In most instances they have no income on which they could fall back, and unless they have children to aid them they must turn to public relief in order to maintain themselves. I believe they should be taken off the relief rolls and provided for in a dignified manner the same as other elderly people.

It is estimated that there are some 6 million people, men and women, between the ages of 60 and 65. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of these people still work and prefer to continue to work. But the few hundred thousand among them who have become ill and disabled cannot receive any benefits until they reach 65 and they face the alternatives of either becoming public charges or starving. Surely, this is no way to treat our senior citizens who have a right to expect at least a minimum of economic security from their country at a time when they can no longer be productive.

I am suggesting in my bill to lower the retirement age for entitlement to social-security benefits from 65 to 60 years. I am familiar with the argument that this will cost us a large sum of money, but at this time I do not wish to go into a full discussion on this point. Suffice it to say, that the same arguments were made when social security was first enacted and they are being made each time an amendment liberalizing the system comes before the Congress. Yet, our social-security fund is growing from year to year. If it is a question of a choice between saving a few hundred million dollars annually or providing economic security to people between 60 and 65 who are dependent on such aid for their daily sustenance, I shall gladly choose the latter. Furthermore, this money will be used by the beneficiaries for food, clothing, rent, and other necessities of life and it will thus go right back into our economy.

Fourth. Extension of coverage: The fourth and last amendment of my bill calls for the extension of coverage to certain professional groups which are not now included in our social-security system. I refer specifically to self-employed lawyers, doctors, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, and optometrists. They should be afforded proper coverage under the law the same as other self-employed persons. There is no reason why these people should be discriminated against in enjoying the same degree of economic security as other American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin to look upon the problem of our aging population in a more realistic and more humane way. To ignore this problem as if it did not exist means that we are committing a grave injustice to millions of our elderly citizens, who deserve better treatment. By enacting the changes proposed in my bill, we shall take a decided step forward toward providing greater economic security for the American people. The provisions suggested in this bill will help to remove some of the more glaring deficiencies of the social-security system.

These amendments are neither unreasonable nor impracticable. It is a sincere effort to improve our social-security system in such a way that existing discriminations are eliminated and the greatest number of our people would be able to look forward in their old age to receiving adequate economic protection. They have earned this protection and they deserve to receive it when they most need it.

Secretary Benson Urged To Move Surplus Cotton Into Export Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, cotton farmers of the country facing a severe hardship of limited production are concerned about the lack of a concerted program to reduce the present cotton surplus.

At a time like this emergency action is needed in the overall interest of our economy.

As an expression of the views of many members of the House of Representatives from throughout the United States, a letter requesting early action has been submitted to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, signed by 129 Members of the House of Representatives. A similar letter was signed by 54 Senators.

Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of the letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We urge that you use existing authority under the Commodity Credit Corporation charter and other legislation to move accumulated stocks of cotton primarily into export channels.

This cotton could be sold with a minimum of disruption here at home and in world markets if a judicious job of merchandising is conducted.

As you know, other authorizations provide opportunities to barter such excess stock for supplemental reserves of strategic materials. We need these materials more than we need the cotton.

There is a need also for us to regain our fair share of the world market.

We share your concern for the fact that present cotton-acreage levels are about to ruin the economies in many of the cotton States. As you know, the income on cotton farms is far below the farm income averages in many other areas. Relief is greatly needed from the standpoint of our entire economy.

We jointly ask your personal attention to the situation which is of such consequence in cotton growing and manufacturing States.

Sincerely,

HAROLD D. COOLEY, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, E. C. GATHINGS, PAUL JONES, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, WILBUR D. MILLS, ALBERT RAINS, A. S. HERLONG, JR., CARL T. DURHAM, NOBLE J. GREGORY, CLIFFORD DAVIS, HENDERSON LANHAM, ROSS BASS, JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., CARL VINSON, PHIL M. LANDRUM, CARL ELLIOTT, HERBERT C. BONNER, J. PERCY PRIEST, ED EDMUNDSON, W. F. NORRELL, JOE L. EVINS, GEORGE W. ANDREWS III, OMAR BURLESON, W. R. HULL, JR., LEE METCALF, GRACIE PFOST, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., MARTIN DIES, ROBERT T. ASHMORE, FRED MARSHALL, MELVIN PRICE, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, B. F. SISK, TOM STEED, GEORGE S. LONG, JOHN J. DEMPSEY, FRANK W. BOYKIN, OTTO E. PASSMAN, DON MAGNUSON, ROBERT C. BYRD, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, ROY W. WIER,

JAMES B. BOWLER, EDWIN E. WILLIS, JOHN JARMAN, JAMES P. RICHARDS, W. R. POAGE, JAMES POLK, JOHN C. WATTS, CARL ALBERT, HARLAN HAGEN, CLARK W. THOMPSON, FRANK E. SMITH, WILLIAM M. COLMER, JERE COOPER, GEORGE M. GRANT, O. C. FISHER, D. R. MATTHEWS, ARTHUR WINSTEAD, OREN HARRIS, OLIN E. TEAGUE, JAMES W. TRIMBLE, JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., PORTER HARDY, HOMER THORNBERRY, ROBERT E. JONES, J. L. PILCHER, E. L. FORRESTER, WRIGHT PATMAN, PAUL BROWN, WALTER ROGERS, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, BRADY GENTRY, WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENNETH A. ROBERTS, JAMES A. HALEY, JOHN DOWDY, LESTER JOHNSON, JIM WRIGHT, J. VAUGHAN GARY, FRANK IKARD, OVERTON BROOKS, JOE M. KILGORE, EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR., GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., WATKINS M. ABBITT, PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., CHARLES B. DEANE, PAT JENNINGS, JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHET HOLIFIELD, JOHN J. ROONEY, JAMES H. MORRISON, H. R. GROSS, BROOKS HAYS, F. ERTEL CARLYLE, STEWART UDALL, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, PAUL G. ROGERS, JOHN A. BLATNIK, JOHN E. MOSS, JR., SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, BYRON G. ROGERS, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, COYA KNUTSON, PAGE BELCHER, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, A. S. J. CARNAHAN, CHARLES E. BENNETT, T. JAMES TUMULTY, JOHN M. PHILLIPS, T. P. O'NEILL, JR., HAROLD O. LOVRE, EDWARD P. BOLAND, MYRON V. GEORGE, THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, WILLIAM S. HILL, H. CARL ANDERSEN, BEN F. JENSEN, CLAIR ENGLE, T. A. THOMPSON, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, J. T. RUTHERFORD, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, TOM MURRAY.

Postmaster General Speeds Clean-Up-the-Mails Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure decent citizens of our country will applaud the efforts of the Post Office Department, under Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, to eliminate the obscene and indecent trash that has been finding its way into postal channels in increasing amounts recently. As the result of this drive the money-hungry purveyors of pornographic publications are going to have greater difficulty getting their lewd materials into the hands of their customers.

While the Post Office Department is without authority to prosecute the mailers of this material, it does have authority to refuse to carry it through the mail. That it is doing as rapidly as the source of the material is learned.

Postmaster General Summerfield recently made a very fine statement on this clean-up-the-mails drive, pointing out it does not involve an abridgement of freedom of speech or press nor sets up a censorship of works of art. This is a sincere effort to keep this unwanted pornographic material from being offered through the mail for delivery into American homes.

The statement of Postmaster General Summerfield follows:

CLEAN-UP-THE-MAILS CAMPAIGN

A growing volume of unwanted lewd and obscene matter is being sent through the mails into American homes, and the Post Office Department is intensifying its clean-up-the-mails efforts to stop this offense against common decency.

Risque snapshots, pornographic magazines and books, and lascivious slides, party films, and records are being widely offered for sale as shown by a 73-percent increase in the last 6 months in cases dealing with indecent materials sent through the mails.

This is a serious and nationwide problem of public morality which affects all our citizens. In our common interest this misuse and prostitution of the mails should be stopped by a sensible preventative program of the Post Office Department, acting for the people as directed by the law enacted by Congress.

We know from experience that any enlightened effort of this kind—no matter how intelligently administered—is occasionally open to attack and ridicule which is frequently deliberately inspired by those who make money from the sale of lewd materials. Sometimes we are criticized because our purposes are not fully understood by the very people we are seeking to protect from pornographic material.

CENSORSHIP NOT INVOLVED

In other instances our efforts to keep the mails clean produce an almost inevitable cry of censorship by certain groups who confuse license with liberty. Their viewpoint, while sincere, seems to suggest an abysmal ignorance of the nature of the problem and the threat it imposes to the moral fiber of the Nation.

We are not concerned with bureaucratic snooping. No issues of abridgments of the freedom of speech or of the press are involved.

We are not arbitrary censors of literary efforts nor of works of art, either ancient or modern.

What we are vitally concerned about is the great mass of unwanted pornographic material being offered for delivery through the mails into the homes of American citizens.

MENACE TO MORAL OF YOUTH

We know the great majority of adult Americans want this obscene material—which they have not asked for—kept out of their homes and away from their children, whether it is generated at home or mailed into this country from abroad. This vile stream of commercialized obscenity persists because there is money in it and we must be alert lest the greed of the individuals and sham publishing concerns who sell it damage the moral standards of our young people.

Many criminal, educational, and religious authorities see a definite connection between this disgraceful upsurge in obscenity and the startling growth of juvenile delinquency in the Nation.

Other experts believe this increase in lewd and lascivious material is reflected in the sickening growth of criminal assaults on girls and women.

While the Post Office Department has no authority to prosecute mailers who offend against common decency, we are required, by law, to refuse to carry obscene material through the mails.

Fortunately the power to exclude pornographic material from the mails is a highly effective preventive measure in that it usually shuts down the most practical and economical distribution method available.

The criterion used in ruling on mailability is the ordinary standard of common decency of average representative citizens. Let me quote a recent ruling on obscene books which illustrates the reasoning used:

"The word 'obscene' is not uncommon and is used in English and American speech and writings as the symbol of indecent, smutty, lewd, or salacious reference to the parts of the human or animal body, or to their functions, or to the excrement therefrom.

"It is, of course, true that the ears of some may be so accustomed to words which are ordinarily regarded as obscene that they take no offense at them, but the law is not tempered to the hardened minority of society.

"The statue forbidding the importation of obscene books is not designed to fit the concept of morality throughout the world, nor for all time past and all the future, but it is designed to fit the normal American concept in the age in which we live.

"It is no legitimate argument that because there are social groups composed of moral delinquents in this or other countries that their language shall be received as legal tender along with the speech of the great masses who trade ideas and information in the honest money of decency."

OUR CITIZENS CAN HELP

Citizens who wish to help the Post Office Department in its clean-up-the-mails campaign can do so by delivering, to their local postmaster, any material received through the mails which they consider obscene. Postmasters throughout the country are being instructed to forward such material here to Washington to the Office of the Solicitor, the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department, for proper action.

Delays in Reaching the Goals of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from lawyers in Chicago I have been receiving enthusiastic comments on the address to the Chicago chapter of the Federal Bar Association of the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of the United States district court for the District of Columbia.

The Chicago chapter of the Federal Bar Association prides itself on the quality of the speakers at its gatherings. It is interesting to recall in this connection that the first public address in Chicago of former President Harry Truman was made at an annual banquet of the Chicago chapter of the Federal Bar Association, my son and namesake at that time being the president of the chapter, and the present Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Thomas Clark, the national president of the Federal Bar Association.

Former President Truman was the Senator from the State of Missouri, the chairman of a committee that had aroused wide public interest. The Honorable Edward J. Kelly then was mayor of Chicago. The visit of Senator Truman to Chicago to make his first public address in that city as the guest speaker of the Chicago chapter of the Federal Bar Association brought Senator Truman and Mayor Kelly again into association. This circumstance may have

been a contributing factor to historic events quickly to follow. In any event, Mayor Kelly not long afterward was a a vital factor in swinging the vice presidential nomination to Mr. Truman. That nomination eventually led to the Presidency and the brilliant era of Truman's administration of the high office of the Chief Executive. It was President Truman who placed Associate Justice Clark first in the office of the Attorney General of the United States and then on the Supreme Court.

The theme of Judge Laws' address was a trend which he thinks presents a serious threat not only to the cause of justice but to the very existence of the courts themselves. This is the trend to long-drawn-out trials both in courts of law and before administrative agencies and tribunals. He directed attention to a few typical cases:

First. Within the past 5 years a suit in the Boston United States court included 4,600 exhibits one of them containing over 1,000 pages. Objections were filed on 2,000 of the exhibits and the hearings then took months, lengthening the trial case to well over a year.

Second. The New York Medina case took more than 2 years and although Judge Laws forgot the number of exhibits he recalled $1 million was spent to transcribe the records alone.

Third. In the District of Columbia a case required approximately 3½ months to hear a motion to dismiss. There were 976 exhibits and 3 judges studied the motion for over a year. The Supreme Court reversed the decision.

Fourth. A case in the District of Columbia in which Judge Laws had a part contained thousands of exhibits in the preliminary stages. Judge Laws understands that the exhibits at the trial may reach between five and ten thousand and the lawyers estimate the actual trial will last from 10 months to a year.

Fifth. In the district court for the District of Columbia if all long cases now on the calendar were tried promptly it would occupy no less than full time for four judges for a year.

Sixth. In studying the calendar in Chicago several months ago a judge told Judge Laws that there were approximately 85 lengthy trials scheduled most of which were antitrust. If all of these were tried it would take the time of 6 judges for 47 months to try them.

Some criminal trials cited:

First. The Bridges case took over 82 trial days and ultimately over 4 months.

Second. Communist cases—Foster, et al.—took 35 trial days, over 2 months, and time used in selecting jury requiring 105 trial days—over 5 months.

Third. A sedition case in the District of Columbia took over 108 days for trial—6½ months—and then the judge died. The prosecution case was not closed.

Fourth. The Judith Coplon case in the District of Columbia was estimated to take a week but took 48 days—2½ months. The New York trial took 50 days for motions, 30 days for trial, a total of over 4 months.

It is a waste of time, expense, and effort.

Judge Laws said—

Many times as I have gone through tedious trials I have thought of the words of the great Teacher: "Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do; for they think they will be heard for their much speaking." I think of the Lord's Prayer, a petition of man to his Creator for guidance; a prayer of 66 words. I also think of our amazing Constitution, with its amendments. This instrument has withstood assaults of more than 160 years of crises, through war and peace, prosperity and depression. This mighty document, simple, concise, definite, with reading time of 18 brief minutes.

We of the law today must combine to find a way to the goal of justice that is shorter, less expensive, and simpler.

Oil for the Lamps of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current approach of a Finnish tanker into the southeast Asia area with a consignment of kerosene for Communist China, I have received inquiries why the United States is, in effect, attempting to "keep oil from the lamps of China," and whether this Government is prepared to go to war "in an attempt to stop the natural industrial development of a nation of 600 million people." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith enter my reply.

The rulers of Communist China have publicly announced their intention of extending their regime to the island of Formosa. They have stated that they would invade that island, and they have massed armed forces along the coasts facing this island. Formosa, however, is an important anchor point of our own Pacific defense perimeter, and military leaders as well as political leaders of both parties are in agreement that an attempt upon Formosa constitutes an attack upon the security of the United States.

Now, kerosene may once have been innocuous oil for the lamps of China. Today, kerosene is fuel for jet propelled aircraft. This Government certainly is not prepared to go to war "in an attempt to stop the natural industrial development of a nation of 600 million people," but I believe we are prepared to defend ourselves against further Communist aggression. And furthermore, I believe that this very preparedness may be the biggest deterrent factor for any such aggression to actually happen.

We have contained Russian expansion in Europe by drawing definite lines, and by backing these lines with arms and men. The lines have remained inviolate. In many Asiatic areas, we have been only too vague in defining the points beyond which we would consider ourselves attacked. Then, on January 24, 1955, President Eisenhower sent his message on Formosa and the Pescadores to the Congress, and in subsequent action—and in a fine show of bipartisan unity—the Congress drew a line in that area.

I thoroughly agree that it is better to use every means possible to settle differences through peaceful negotiations, and to avoid interference in the internal affairs of other countries. I believe we are doing both. We are peaceful people who do not fight unless attacked. We are carrying the principal burden for maintenance and upkeep of the United Nations because we believe that this organization furnishes the platform on which peace can be served in multilateral negotiation and international supervision. We have offered to share our knowledge of the atom with others for peaceful endeavor. We have submitted plans for the outlawing of atomic weapons and a system of international inspection. We are always willing to negotiate if the cause of honorable peace can be served.

In the case of Formosa, we are confronted not with a difference of opinion, but with the announced intention to make war upon a bastion in our own defenses. We have clearly and calmly announced our intention to counter any such attack if it is made. We are all for the oil that can soothe the troubled international waters. The oil that sends jet planes screaming against our own lines must, of necessity, receive different consideration.

National Sunday School Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the fact that the week of April 11 through 17 is one that is to be observed as National Sunday School Week—a special week dedicated to the youth of America, no matter what their creed. For the past 11 years this worthy cause has been promoted throughout the United States under the auspices of the Layman's National Committee, Inc., an organization made up of men and women from business and industry who have pledged themselves to the common cause of furthering religion in our everyday life. However much they may differ on other matters, they unite in supporting religion that reduces itself in action to the principle of the Golden Rule, which is the foundation of the best in our American life. And so very strongly does this committee feel about the continuance of our American way of life that its members are constantly devoting untiring efforts to the proper dissemination of information regarding the fundamental principles on which our Nation was first established. They must be understood and preserved

and strengthened if our country is to be preserved and strengthened.

This year the Laymen's National Committee has chosen as its theme for Sunday School Week "Sunday Schools Are the Root-Strength of Our Nation's Youth."

Permanent Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, over a period of the last month I have had a most interesting and informative exchange of correspondence with the Department of State. The matters of principle which are involved and their effects on the possibilities for the development of permanent peace in the Middle East are of such importance that I believe my colleagues will be glad to give it their attention. I am, therefore, inserting under unanimous consent three items—first, my letter to the Secretary of State; second, the reply from the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State; third, my reply to him. In order to bring them within the limitations of material allowed in the RECORD, I have divided them into two separate insertions—i. e., first, the letter to the Secretary of State; and, second, Mr. Morton's answer and my reply.

FEBRUARY 4, 1955.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I venture to write to you in connection with recent developments in the Middle East.

Like many of my colleagues, I am particularly interested in the attainment of a peaceful settlement in that troubled region. Like most Americans, I was very proud that our country was able to play an important part in the establishment and the growth of the State of Israel. It is one of the significant achievements of the last decade. I am fully aware of your deep interest in the difficult problems in this area, and I am familiar not only with your own personal contribution in the establishment of Israel but also with your efforts to strengthen the entire region.

The issue which dictates this letter is the news that we have now sent military equipment to Iraq. I had been pleased to hear several weeks ago that the administration was evaluating its whole policy in the Near East. I had been looking forward, therefore, to the measures which the administration planned to take to reassure both Israel and the Arabs against any renewal of hostilities. Accordingly, it had been my hope that, pending some revision in the attitude of the Arab situation or the development of some positive program to promote an Arab-Israel reconciliation, we would have refrained from sending arms to the Arab countries.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to review all the arguments against the supply of arms to the Arab countries. But I am firmly convinced that this policy will neither strengthen our defenses in the area nor will it win us new friends. On the contrary, I have felt that the program will weaken our defenses because it will make peace more difficult to attain; it will certainly tend to weaken the one country that is firmly alined with the West; it will raise false hopes among Arab leaders; and, in the end, it will earn us more enemies than friends.

If we give arms without requiring that there is substantial progress toward a real and lasting peace between Iraq and Israel as a condition of our support, we would be failing to utilize one of the few remaining instruments for peace at our disposal. Moreover, if we pour arms into the Arab countries, we shall whet unhealthy appetites. No matter how much we give, we shall reap a harvest of disappointment. In this connection, I call your attention to the interesting dispatch from Baghdad which appeared in the New York Times on January 14. I quote:

"Considerable disappointment was expressed here when the first United States shipment, said to have been composed exclusively of vehicles and engineer equipment, arrived as Basra December 19. Opposition deputies in Parliament wanted to know why heavy weapons had not been delivered and they charged that the United States program had been cut to $25 million a year.

"The Government replied that United States material would be initially devoted to increasing the mobility and improving the communications of Iraq's forces. Negotiations on larger items are now in progress, it was said."

This suggests that our experience may not be dissimilar from that of the British who learned to their bitter disappointment that the gift of their assistance and weapons did not necessarily win them friendship.

I do not imply that our policy indicates any lack of friendship or good will for Israel. But the course we pursue may have the appearance of coolness toward Israel and may be interpreted in the Arab world in a manner opposed to the best interest of peace and cooperation. Under the circumstances, it is my hope that the administration will soon come forward with a clear program which will, without question, clarify that their goal in the Middle East is the friendship and reconciliation of all the peoples there. To attain that goal, it seems to me to be imperative that we suspend further arms shipments until the Arab States have agreed to the machinery of negotiation with Israel and to call off their present boycotts and blockades. Unhappily, I see no indication of this today. Indeed, the Egyptian reaction to our criticism of the Suez blockade indicates that Egypt remains firm in its hostility toward Israel and has little or no inclination toward a program of peace. (I hasten to add that it was most gratifying to see that our United Nations delegation spoke so definitely on this issue during the recent discussion at the United Nations Security Council.)

I am keenly aware of the strategic importance of Iraq, of their inclination to be friendly with the other objectives of the United States and of the necessity of our development of this friendship. I hope that we are not compelled to go forward with further arms shipments to Iraq, but if we are for some unknown reason to me, I would like to see an expression from the administration to the effect that Israel is being included in our regional defense planning. It is difficult to see how we can justify the exclusion of the Israel fighting forces from our program.

Above all else, however, it seems to me that the time has come for some assurances that none of the arms shipped to any country in the Near East will be used in acts of aggression against any other country with which we have relations, and most certainly we need the assurance that these arms will never be used except for a strictly defensive purpose. To this date I have seen nothing from Baghdad which expressly assures the Western World that our arms will not be used against Israel. On the other hand, I have seen belligerent statements from Premier Faris el Khoury of Syria summoning the Arabs to accept our arms for use against Israel. The alarm thus caused is, therefore, substantial and real.

The kind of guaranties which could be meaningful or feasible under these circumstances can best, of course, come from the studies of the State Department made on this problem. If, however, a positive program and statement could be made that any aggressive military action by any country of the Near East to whom we have given military or economic aid and assistance would immediately justify our active intervention to prevent its spread, it would, I believe, receive widespread congressional and nationwide support. I am certain that many of my colleagues, as well as our constituents, share our deep apprehensions on this issue.

I would appreciate hearing from you.

With assurance of my high respect and desire to be of constructive assistance, I am,

Very sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Permanent Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, previously I included in the RECORD my letter to the Secretary of State on the subject of permanent peace in the Middle East. I now submit the reply received from the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, and my comments on his interesting information. As I stated, in view of the imminent consideration by the Congress of appropriations covering the foreign operations field, I hope that my colleagues will find time to give this matter their consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 10, 1955.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Thank you for your letter of February 4, 1955, expressing your views concerning military assistance to Iraq and the other Arab countries. We appreciate your conveying to us your thoughts on this matter.

There is enclosed a statement recently prepared by the Department of State giving United States policy on the question of military assistance to countries of the Middle East and measures taken to ensure that this military assistance will not be used for aggressive purposes.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

UNITED STATES POLICY WITH REGARD TO MILITARY AID TO THE NEAR EAST

The policy of the United States in supplying arms to the Near East is guided by the

principles set forth in the tripartite declaration of May 25, 1950, issued by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. This declaration recognized that both the Arab states and Israel needed to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring internal security and self-defense, and at the same time emphasized that an arms race between the Arab states and Israel should not be permitted to develop. It further made clear the intention of these powers to prevent aggression among those states.

These considerations have been reflected in the decisions of this Government with regard to (1) issuing licenses for the export of arms purchased by the Near East governments on the commercial market and (2) making it possible for Near East governments to purchase and export certain arms not available on commercial market, under the terms of section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended. The United States Government has maintained a position of impartiality with regard to both these types of arms exports, discriminating against neither the Arab states nor Israel.

Sales of arms to the Near East and Middle East under these policies have been limited, and the area remains relatively defenseless against possible outside aggression. This has been a matter of growing concern to the United States Government. The 1st session of the 83d Congress in 1953 authorized, in section 202 (b) of the mutual security legislation for 1954, and appropriated funds for United States military assistance to certain of the countries of this area where the President considers such assistance will serve the purposes of the act.

On February 25, 1954, the President announced the first action taken under this authority—the decision to extend military aid to Pakistan. In the President's statement announcing this decision, there were included the following passages:

"This Government has been gravely concerned over the weakness of defensive capabilities in the Middle East. It was for the purposes of helping to increase the defense potential in this area that Congress in its last session appropriated funds to be used to assist those nations in the area which desired such assistance, which would pledge their willingness to promote international peace and security within the framework of the United Nations, and which would take effective collective measures to prevent and remove threats to peace.

"Let me make it clear that we shall be guided by the stated purposes and requirements of the mutual security legislation. These include specifically the provision that equipment, materials, or services provided will be used solely to maintain the recipient country's internal security and for its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part. Any recipient country also must undertake that it will not engage in any act of aggression against any other nation. These undertakings afford adequate assurance to all nations, regardless of their political orientation and whatever their international policies may be, that the arms the United States provides for the defense of the free world will in no way threaten their own security. I can say that if our aid to any country, including Pakistan, is misused, and directed against another in aggression I will undertake immediately, in accordance with my costitutional authority, appropriate action both within and without the U. N. to thwart such aggression. I would also consult with the Congress on further steps.

"The United States earnestly desires that there be increased stability and strength in the Middle East, as it has desired this same thing in other parts of the free world. It believes that the aspirations of the peoples in this area for maintaining and developing their way of life and for realizing the social advances close to their hearts will be best served by strength to deter aggression and to reduce the fear of aggression. The United States is prepared to help in this endeavor, if its help is wanted.

"PRESIDENT EISENHOWER."

President Eisenhower further states in his address on October 20, 1954, at the American Jewish tercentenary dinner, that—

"In the Near East, we are all regretfully aware that the major differences between Israel and the Arab States remain unresolved. Our goal there, as elsewhere, is a just peace. By friendship toward both, we shall continue to contribute to peaceful relations among these peoples. And in helping to strengthen the security of the entire Near East, we shall make sure that any arms we provide are devoted to that purpose, not to creating local imbalances which could be used for intimidation of or aggression against any neighboring nations. In every such arrangement we make with any nation, there is ample assurance that this distortion of purpose cannot occur."

On April 21, 1954, an agreement was made for Iraq to receive United States military assistance, such assistance having been requested in March 1953 for the purpose of strengthening Iraqui forces for the defense of the country against possible aggression. In requesting this help, the Iraqi Government linked its national defense with the defense of the vital resources of the free world against the danger of Communist expansion. Included in the agreement is a provision that "assistance will be provided subject to the provisions of applicable legislative authority and will be related in character, timing and amount to international developments in the area."

Evidence of Iraq's determination to deal effectively wtih domestic Communist activities may be found in recent severe measures taken by the Government against membership in the Communist Party and Communist activities. In addition to these measures, the Government is attempting to lessen the appeal of communism by raising the general living standards through land reform and other measures and through an economic development program for which 70 percent of the country's considerable oil revenues are earmarked.

The announcement on January 13, 1955, of the intention of Iraq and Turkey to conclude a mutual defense treaty further demonstrates Iraq's clear realization of the danger which threatens the area and her desire to cooperate with others in meeting that danger. (Public Services Division, Department of State, Washington, D. C., January 18, 1955.)

MARCH 18, 1955.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have carefully gone over the statement of United States Policy with Regard to Military Aid to the Near East, dated January 18, 1955, which you were kind enough to send me in response to the letter which I sent to Secretary of State Dulles.

In my letter I expressed concern over our current programs to furnish military assistance to Iraq and other Arab countries in advance of an Arab-Israel peace. I do not believe that your answer adequately responds to my inquiry or allays my concern in this serious matter.

Your statement declares that United States policy in supplying arms to the Near East is guided by the principles set forth in the tripartite declaration of May 25, 1950. This Declaration, you point out, recognized that both the Arab States and Israel needed to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of internal security and self-defense and at the same time emphasized that an arms race between the Arab states and Israel should not be permitted to develop. You go on to say that with regard to the issuing of licenses for the export of arms and the purchase and export of arms not available on the commercial market, the United States has "maintained a position of impartiality, discriminating against neither the Arab states nor Israel."

Having thus declared our Government's desire to be impartial and to prevent an arms race, you then proceed to state that arms are being furnished to Iraq but you offer no explanation of the fact that no arms are going to Israel although it is my understanding that Israel requested our arms back in 1952. This is not impartiality—this is clear discrimination.

Furthermore, it is clear that if we are to press our arms upon Iraq and other Arab states and deny them to Israel, we are inevitably provoking a disastrous arms race, which will put a tremendous burden on all the people of the area and which may lead to a renewal of the fighting. Accordingly, it seems plain that our current program does not follow the 1950 tripartite declaration. It flouts it.

You quote a statement of the President to the effect that "in helping to strengthen the security of the entire Near East, we shall make sure that any arms we provide are devoted to that purpose, not to creating local imbalances which could be used for intimidation of or aggression against any neighboring nations."

The President may have the finest of intentions in approving the shipment of arms to these countries, but how can he guarantee the intentions of the recipients?

He goes on to state, "In every such arrangement we make with any nation, there is ample assurance that this distortion of purpose cannot occur." But as I read that portion of the Iraq-United States agreement which you have provided me with and which is relevant to this subject matter, I see no express undertaking by the Government of Iraq not to use our arms for a renewal of aggression against Israel. The language that is used in this agreement is extremely vague—pointedly so. So vague, in fact, that the Baghdad radio hailed the agreement as unconditional. It would therefore seem that the Arab States do not interpret this agreement as you do.

It seems evident that we do not have sufficient influence with the Arab countries to persuade them to agree, as a condition for the receipt of our arms, that they will renounce their aggressive intentions against Israel. If our influence is of such little consequence, would we really be able to halt an outbreak of fighting should it occur?

Nothing you have submitted to me diminishes my fear that we are taking the most reckless gamble with Middle East peace if we continue to pursue these unstable Arab governments, press our favors upon them whether they wish them or not, shower them with lethal weapons whether they can use them or not; secure their signatures on pacts whether they mean them or not; and all without taking the first and necessary step for an effective program for Middle East development and defense, the promotion of peace negotiations between the Arab States and Israel.

It may be that the time is still unpropitious to bring Israel and the Arab States together into direct negotiations looking toward a peace settlement. But if this is still

true 7 years after Israel was established; if the Arab States still refuse even to recognize her existence, how can we possibly ignore the efficient threats which emanate from Arab leaders? How can we risk giving them the weapons to translate their declarations into deeds?

All of us agree that we must strengthen the Middle East so that it can resist Communist aggression. But I cannot see how we strengthen this area if we arm one side and ignore the other; if we create a military imbalance; if we refuse to recognize threats at their face value; if we continue to condone boycotts and blockades and a flagrant rejection of obligations under the United Nations Charter.

We will not strengthen an area if, as a result of our policy, we keep it in tension and turmoil. As to so many other areas of the world, the need is for bold and positive leadership with an emphasis on peace. First we need a firm declaration of fundamental principles. Next we need action to implement them. When will our Government make clear to the whole Middle East that never will we let Israel suffer from armed aggression, when will it make clear that every treaty, pact, or agreement made in the area to which we are party or to which we have given our approval must include all the nations on an equal footing? When will we openly seek similar action from our allies, such as France, who have influence and interests in the area?

In summary I most earnestly urge that our Government undertake a dynamic program to meet and conquer the root causes of conflict in the Middle East. Certainly the United States, in building its opposition to subversion and aggression, will not ignore or help injure the only really democratic government in the whole area. Surely we will not abandon the ally most dedicated to friendship toward our own ideals and one most ready and willing, if necessary, to fight for them.

Inasmuch as this entire question will come before the Congress shortly during our consideration of the mutual-security program, I trust that a definitive statement will soon be forthcoming from the administration.

Very truly yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

NACA Keeps the Ceiling Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in an era so thoroughly dominated by the airplane that it is commonly—and I think quite appropriately—termed the air age, it is fitting to observe the 40th anniversay of an organization which has had a major part in making our country the undisputed leader in the field of aeronautics. I refer to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which today celebrates its 40th anniversary.

Considering that the entire modern history of human flight is not much older than 50 years, the NACA is "old." I am glad to know from firsthand experience, however, that the great usefulness of the organization is continuously increasing, that the rich experience of the past 40 years finds expression in a most constructive and dynamic program of aeronautical research. I know I am on safe ground when I say that it is the work of the NACA which keeps America not only abreast but ahead of other countries in civilian as well as military aviation.

Mr. Speaker, near the cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale, in the 10th District of California, which I represent, there is an installation known as Ames Laboratory. While much of the work performed at Ames is by its very nature a closely guarded secret, it is common knowledge that flying today in its gigantic wind tunnels are the military aircraft of 1960 and the speedy airliner of 1965. Ames Laboratory is operated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Its equipment includes the world's largest wind tunnel, a monster with a test section measuring 40 by 80 feet. Here, under the able direction of Dr. Smith J. DeFrance, the NACA can subject plane models to speeds fast enough to melt any known material on earth; speeds fast enough even to melt diamonds. The answers that are found in the caverns of Ames Laboratory will help the American aircraft industry to build the planes and missiles of tomorrow. I have no doubt that every one of our current aircraft and missiles reflects in important ways the fruit of scientific studies conducted at this California research center.

In 1915, when our Government took the initiative and appointed the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, our country was woefully behind France, Germany, England, and other nations in the development of aircraft. A large measure of thanks must go to the NACA for pulling our Nation far ahead in subsequent years. On the occasion of its 40th anniversary we owe a vote of thanks to this organization which quietly, patriotically, and with great ability helps American wings to fly higher, faster, safer, and more efficiently, and which gives American aviation its true "ceiling unlimited."

Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to have entered my testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee which was considering prospective legislation for Federal aid to school construction.

The testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, may I first say that I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to testify on the very important matter before this forum. I sincerely hope that my request for hearing will not be construed as indicating a personal presumption of my expertness on the varied problems plaguing our educational system. I am sure that this committee has heard, or is scheduled to hear, qualified educators in regards the technical aspects of the question. The message I should like to bring this committee deals with the broader governmental concepts that rest at the base of our important social, economic, and political problems.

This committee has recently heard from our very able colleague from Arizona, Representative STEWART L. UDALL, who very concisely disclosed two very important, as he termed it, "stumbling blocks" that have blockaded much of the thinking in the area of Federal aid to school construction. The clarity of his reasoning, I am sure, has shed a brighter light upon a segment of our thinking made dark by such ominous forebodings of late as: "Get government out of business get government out of public power," and now: "Keep government out of education." Even the most credulous individual cannot fail to recognize the frailty of these manifestations—it smacks more of emotion than reason; and as such, I fear, unable to cope with the immense problem of properly providing our youth with adequate educational facilities.

In deference to the plan proposed by the administration, which I'm sure this committee is giving arduous study, I feel that its half-way approach fails theoretically to understand this Government's obligations to its citizenry by subjecting the school districts to an unreasonable indebtedness. Our desperate school districts cry for relief, but their supplications, I fear, have been answered by a master bond-issuing program designed, not for their relief, but rather their insolvency. To peg an unrealistic interest rate on our Nation's school districts for the sake of attracting risk capital to the safe confines of municipal securities, which guarantee a safe return, is neither a service to our school system nor a discharge of our responsibility to it. Educating America's youth is a public responsibility historically vested in the local community through the instrumentalities of the city, county and State governments; and, if the situation so requires, ultimately with the Federal Government. When Federal assistance to the health and welfare of the several States falls suspect, then, indeed, the entire edifice of our great constituted system of Federal Government, which has served us well, must be reexamined. I, for one, harbor not such dismal fear those who do have somewhere parted company with a great tradition.

THE GENESIS OF THE PROBLEM—RAPID GROWTH OF POPULATION

We have had occasion to point with singular pride to the robust expansion of our population in the last 15 years. (Approximately 30 million; a yearly average increase in excess of 2 million). Latently contained in this national asset lies the cause of the present problem. The dislocations of one major war, the continuing condition of world unrest which necessitates a priority to national security problems, and the parallel high level of consumer-goods production have diverted our energies to these important areas to the exclusion of schools and their educational plants and facilities. No doubt this fact has been generally regarded as a preestablished axiom with those of us who have concerned ourselves with the question. The significance of this fact, I feel, finds its force in the realization that the stauration

point has been achieved; and in many areas superseded, so as to be justifiably termed disaster areas. We have provisions to meet this crisis in the actual physical sense; but have failed to affect like remedial machinery for our educational disaster areas. I see no genuine deterrent in the path of our Federal Government to meet this challenge.

INCREASED COMPLEXITY OF OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

As populations have grown so have the corresponding accompanying needs of that increased citizenry progressed. The simplified curriculums offered in my grade school days now appear skeletal alongside the courses of study given our youths today. The entire machinery of education has become more complex, and in turn, has required a greater competence of its administrators. The problem is real, complex, and enduring; the need must be answered realistically, intricately, and with far reaching vision. Any legislation that falls short of achieving these minimal requirements must be termed inadequate. Any legislation that makes these considerations secondary to the dreams of certain financial interests, for the sake of providing a safe harborage for bond purchasers, misinterprets, I feel, the basic interest of the majority of the American people.

THE PROBLEM FACED IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN AND ITS PLANS TO MEET IT

With the committee's permission, I should like to commend to its study and perusal, without burdening the official record, a report by the Department of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan. It aptly demonstrates the type of efforts which I am sure are being put forth by similar State agencies throughout the country. I am proud to be associated in the service of government with such able and dedicated public servants as we have in our great State of Michigan. As this report indicates, much thought and planning has gone into estimating our State's educational needs in the coming 5 years. Their work is clearly demonstrative of their efforts to seek first a solution to their shortages which took into account the State's own resources before considering direct aid from the Federal Government. I think that this is a fair and honest approach to the matter and commend it as an example worthy of emulation.

Significantly, it will be noticed on page 68 of the report (Michigan Public School Building Needs, 1953–60) that the area of Government financial assistance is only contemplated for "hardship areas." This is a proper concern for the Federal and State Governments, since these hardship areas often exist through forces beyond the scope of the local school district means to afford a remedy. Of our State's 534 school-service areas, 117 are estimated to be hardship cases. Such factors as shifting population, realty devaluation, and lack of adequate local taxing powers have been inextricably intertwined at the base of the school district's inability to raise funds. As a direct result of the presence of these variable determinants, our State faces in the school year 1959–60 a deficit of $50 million for needed school construction. In this predicament, I am quite sure, gentlemen, that the plight of Michigan is neither unique nor singular.

Therefore, gentlemen of this committee, may I commend to your deliberations a course of legislative action that affords expeditious aid by direct grant in participation with the several States to our "educational disaster areas" adequate to meet their critical needs. I further recommend that such plan be so designed as to avoid imposing upon our school districts a continuing financial burden.

We are dealing here in the critical commodity of human resources. Let us afford it the priority parallel to the great role it must play in our Nation's destiny.

Thank you kindly.

Help for Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak out in behalf of the families of the more than 5,800,000 mentally retarded and handicapped children in the United States, and to point out the urgent need for assistance to these burdened folk that would in part be provided by enactment of my bill, H. R. 2205, now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

The present Social Security Act provides for the payment of benefits to surviving children until they reach the age of 18 years, and for the vast proportion of our people this is a sound provision. We want our mothers to be able, insofar as it is possible to make it so, to remain at home with their children even though they have lost their husbands and fathers, so that our children may have the immeasurable benefit of a normal home and proper care. And for most of our families, it is safe to assume that the children will become self-supporting when they reach 18.

For the families of many, however, this is not true. Can the child who is permanently and severely mentally retarded or crippled be expected to earn a living and to free his widowed mother to do likewise? The answer is, of course, an emphatic no. If anything, the need for special care of the abnormal child above age 18 creates a demand upon the widowed mother far greater than that experienced in caring for normal children under 18 years.

This principle has been recognized in almost every major insurance and retirement plan of the Federal Government. H. R. 2205 would give long overdue recognition to it by amending the Social Security Act to provide benefits to surviving children above the age of 18 who are so mentally or physically disabled that they are unable to earn an independent livelihood, and to continue the widow's benefits for their mothers who must remain at home and care for their handicapped children. By specifying that the child's disability must be a longstanding one, originating before age 18, H. R. 2205 provides a safeguard against any possible abuse of the benefits and at the same time facilitates determination of eligibility for the benefits.

In moving to expand the social-security system, we must always consider whether the additional benefits, however justified on moral ground, are actuarially sound. I have studied this aspect of my bill carefully, and I am convinced that no argument against these benefits can be made on actuarial grounds. Even though enactment of H. R. 2205 will provide benefits to approximately 10,000 handicapped children and their widowed mothers, the estimated additional cost to the fund would not require an increase in the payroll tax, according to computations of social-security experts I have consulted with. Since there are now about 1 million children on the rolls, if current ratios continue, the number of children on the rolls would only be increased by about 1/110 if H. R. 2205 were enacted into law. This expansion of the program, from a cost standpoint, is indeed minute.

Small in cost, yes; but the aid this legislation would give to widows with handicapped children would be of tremendous value in easing their burden of misfortune by providing them with a minimum income for independent existence, and by easing the poverty which so many of them suffer in addition to the permanent sorrow of having an abnormal child. The husbands and fathers earned these benefits, and it is only just that their widows and children should at last receive them.

The President Shares a Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday our entire Nation was electrified by the excellent news that American science had discovered an answer to infantile paralysis. Yesterday President Eisenhower, in one of the greatest and most magnanimous gestures ever made, decreed that all mankind should benefit from this discovery, as he made the Salk vaccine available to all nations, regardless of their political complexion.

In this time of strife and tension, I cannot think of a more effective way to demonstrate the true moral fiber of America. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the man who not long ago offered to share the secrets of the atom for peaceful use with all comers, spontaneously offered the process of the Salk vaccine in order to combat disease and better the lot of human beings wherever they may live.

We have much for which to be thankful, but nothing I can think of makes me more proud and grateful to be an American than does this great and humane act of our great President. I hope that the Voice of America will do its part in telling all the world that the Nation which is alleged to harbor sinister secrets of destruction is giving to the entire world the wonderful secret of how to eliminate infantile paralysis.