

United States urging the enactment of legislation to bring domestic tin into the same category as tungsten and other strategic metals, extending over a period of years sufficient to allow ample time for privately financed exploration, and thereafter development and production from the existing domestic deposits, and those which may be discovered; 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. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5316. A bill for the relief of Marianne Harpeng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5317. A bill for the relief of Matt Rayner, Frank Rayner, and Ole Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 5318. A bill for the relief of Gong Poy (also known as Gong Suey Way and Fred Gong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 5319. A bill for the relief of Brigitte Koehler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5320. A bill for the relief of Elpis Eleptheria Morelell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5321. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Peterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 5322. A bill for the relief of Sister Jules M. Bernadette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5323. A bill for the relief of Khalil S. A. Aoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5324. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Gafner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5325. A bill for the relief of Sam Fatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

179. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the American Bar Association urging the repeal of title V, entitled "Fees and Charges" of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

180. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Grand Knight, Rockaway Council No. 2672, Knights of Columbus, Rockaway Beach, Long Island, N. Y., expressing their support of the Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Trade Program in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following address by the Honorable ALBERT GORE, in New York City, before the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., upon the occasion of the receipt of the annual Cordell Hull award:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, to be chosen for the Cordell Hull award of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education is an honor which has a special significance for me. I have known former Secretary Hull since my boyhood in the little town of Carthage, Tenn. I guess that if I had a real idol, as a boy, that idol was Judge Hull. He was the Congressman from my district, and I have a very vivid memory of the times I used to sit on the grass in front of the courthouse in Carthage and listen spellbound, as Judge Hull talked about national and international affairs. Later, when I began to have ambitions of my own, Judge Hull was kind and generous enough to encourage me. He is still my ideal of what an American statesman should be.

In my opinion, one of the greatest contributions Cordell Hull made to the prosperity of the Nation was his conception of what expanded international trade would mean. When Judge Hull became Secretary of State in 1933 our economy was in such a serious decline that it was obvious that some emergency action had to be taken. We and other nations of the world were hiding behind high-tariff walls and trying to outdo each other in erecting barriers to international trade. As a result, the 2-way flow of goods so necessary to economic life and vitality had practically ceased, and our international commerce had become stagnant. Unsalable surpluses piled up, arteries of trade became choked and clogged, and millions of men became hungry and desperate. Our farmers and workers needed jobs, and they needed markets for the output of their labor.

In searching for a cure for this atrophy of commerce, Judge Hull lifted his sights above

the ordinary petty squabbles of the domestic market place. He sought to develop new markets abroad which would absorb our surplus production. But he knew that to sell abroad, we must be willing to buy from abroad. So he came forward with the idea of making agreements with other countries to lower some of our trade barriers to their products, in exchange for agreements by those countries to open some of their markets to us.

The basic formula worked so well that it is still in effect. The reciprocal-trade program that Judge Hull gave us is still good—but to remain a living, vital force for the expansion of our economy, it must be liberalized somewhat to take into account present-day situations. Even the best of programs must be kept abreast of the times, must be nourished from time to time with new enthusiasm and new ideas.

President Eisenhower has asked the Congress to extend the life of the program for another 3 years, and to make some very moderate improvements.

I am convinced that passage of H. R. 1 is the very minimum that should be done to bolster our sagging foreign trade, and to maintain the unity among free nations that we have achieved at such great cost. Failure to take this minimum step would signal a return to the protectionist policies which played a significant part in wrecking our economy in the early 1930's. More than that, it would seriously damage the grand alliance of free nations that stands with us as a bulwark against the spread of communism.

Last fall I went to Geneva as a United States delegate to an international conference on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. While there I had an opportunity to talk to officials of dozens of countries. From these talks I got the impression that the whole free world was waiting to see what direction our international trade policy would take. I am convinced that any indication on our part of a return to protectionist policies would cause a stampede among other nations to raise their tariffs and erect any other protectionist barriers they can devise. For that reason alone, though there are many others, it is imperative that the President be given the new authority he asks under H. R. 1, without crippling amendments.

H. R. 1 has passed the House of Representatives, where it got by on a margin of one vote. It is now before the Senate Finance Committee. During the past few days

I have been surveying the situation in the Senate. What I learned is most disturbing. The shocking truth is that as of now the President's program is in grave danger of defeat.

I know you are asking yourselves how it can be that this program is in danger of defeat if it is so important to our economic well-being, if it is so necessary to the strengthening of the free nations of the world in their fight against the spread of communism. I, too, have sought an answer to that question, and I think I have a part of it.

With the election of a Democratic Congress last fall it was assumed by most of those interested in seeing a liberalized foreign trade program enacted, that there would be very little difficulty in passing the President's program. But it appears we did not reckon seriously enough with the high-tariff lobby. That lobby has carried on a furious propaganda campaign against the trade program, while supporters of the program, for the most part, have failed to combat this campaign.

Supporters of the program should have been warned by the close vote in the House of Representatives that there was serious trouble afoot. But apparently that warning passed practically unheeded, and while those who favor an enlightened international trade program are snug in their complacency, the high-tariff lobby is busy trying to influence public opinion and win votes against the program with an insidious campaign of misinformation.

This is not the first time the tariff lobby has attempted to sell one-sided half-truths to try to block an enlightened trade program. That lobby has been in business a long time. Even in President Woodrow Wilson's day it was at work, and its efforts became so notorious that President Wilson felt compelled to issue a statement of warning to the country. Because I think that warning would be applicable today, I want to read what President Wilson had to say:

"I think the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations in the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, and so insidious a lobby. The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead not only the judgment of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an

appearance of a pressure of opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill.

"It is of serious interest to the country that the people at large should have no lobby and be voiceless in these matters, while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and overcome the interests of the public for their private profit. It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of this matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it."

It is unfortunate that everything that President Wilson said about the tariff lobby in his day applies to that lobby today. It is unfortunate, too, that President Eisenhower has not emulated President Wilson's warning that the tariff lobby threatens the national interests. President Eisenhower must fight for the reciprocal-trade program and win the support of at least a few Republican Senators, or it will be defeated. So far the Senate has had only a tepid presidential message, and this seems to have had no effect upon Senators of the President's own political party who last year voted unanimously against the program.

Meanwhile, the lobby seeks to convince businessmen they are likely to be bankrupted by competition from imports, and it seeks to scare labor with the specter of unemployment caused by failure of businesses unable to meet import competition. But industries that really suffer from imports are decidedly in the minority, and in most cases only a few specialty lines in a given industry would have substantial difficulty meeting import competition. But the tariff lobby has tried to frighten all industry and all Members of the Senate by harping on the possible or imaginary plight of a few specialty lines. I insist that this practice has gone too far, and it is grossly misleading and dangerous to our country.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in 1953 estimated that 4,376,000 workers in this country owe their jobs to foreign trade. This is a very significant portion of our working force. Meanwhile, the Randall Commission, appointed by the President to study trade problems, estimated in a staff paper that only 202,000 workers might be adversely affected if all tariffs were suspended. Of course, H. R. 1 does not call for the suspension of all tariffs by any means. It only authorizes the President to make selective reductions in tariffs not to exceed 5 percent per year for the next 3 years. But to all of this, the tariff lobby is blind. It overlooks the serious impact a return to protectionism would have on more than 4 million persons whose jobs depend upon foreign trade.

The lobby runs heavy advertising campaigns in Washington newspapers, and now it has set off a letter-writing campaign from the home State of each Senator. Some of the letters we receive from constituents are no doubt genuine. But many more are obviously inspired by the tariff lobby. The lobby has gone to great pains to make the letters seem plausible and genuine, but after you read a few of them you begin to see the same ideas, phrases, and wording coming up again and again.

One letter I got is a prime example of what the lobby can do with its fear technique. This letter, well written and on the surface apparently plausible, came from the head of a very substantial business in Tennessee. The letter indicated this man's business was suffering seriously from import competition, and might be wiped out if H. R. 1 were passed. But what were the facts on imports of his product?

Well, imports were running at about \$13,000 a year, but exports were more than \$800,-

000. The tariff lobby had so misled and so frightened this businessman that he was ready to jeopardize an \$800,000 export business in order to cut off \$13,000 worth of imports. A good trade program would help this man expand his export market.

There you see the picture—the tariff lobby trying to frighten and enlist in its cause even persons who have a very great stake in passage of H. R. 1.

Because there are a few specialty lines in the cotton-textile industry which experience strong competition, the lobby has sought to convince Congress that the whole textile industry is in danger. Cotton-textile workers are one of the prime targets of the lobby. It has created fear of unemployment among these workers and played upon that fear in a most unpardonable manner. It has convinced many of these workers that they are slowly being driven out of their jobs by import competition. But what are the facts?

We produce cotton cloth at the rate of about 10 billion square yards a year. Imports were about a half of 1 percent of that amount, or 50 million square yards, but those imports were far more than offset by exports of 600 million square yards. That is, we sold abroad 12 times as much cotton cloth as we imported. Cotton-textile workers have a very great interest in expanding those markets abroad so they can sell more of their product, and the authority granted the President in H. R. 1 would help to expand those markets.

Coal miners are another group to which the lobby's propaganda is directed. The miners are told that the serious decline in the market for coal is due to imports of residual fuel oil from Venezuela. Now no one will deny that the coal industry is in a distressed condition. From 1947 to 1953 it lost markets for 155 million tons of coal. But during those same years the increase in use of residual fuel oil was equivalent to only 11 million tons of coal. So the coal industry must look elsewhere for reasons for the loss of markets for at least 144 million tons of coal. During this same period, coal exports declined by 35 million tons. Recapture of those export markets would answer part of the problem, and passage of H. R. 1 could very well facilitate that recapture.

The chemical industry also presents a picture of unreasoned fear. It is one of our fastest growing industries, increasing production by about 10 percent a year as compared to 4 percent a year for all industry. Last year its production was worth about \$20 billion. Its exports were worth just under 1 billion, but chemical imports were valued at only about a fourth as much. In addition, imports are on the decline. Last year they were 15 percent under the 1953 level.

We simply must find some way to inform the public that it is being hoaxed by the tariff lobby; we must find a way to let the people know what is at stake, that their larger interest lies in an expansion rather than in a shrinkage of trade. Otherwise, the program may suffer defeat, and this great practical approach to greater prosperity developed by Cordell Hull will wither on the vine. Then the race to protectionism will start once again and international trade will stagnate. Our economy and the economies of the free world nations will suffer. I can think of nothing that would better suit the purposes of the Kremlin in Moscow.

Looking beyond congressional action on H. R. 1, there is still another important trade battle to be fought this year. On Monday our representatives signed at Geneva a series of agreements for revision of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which was first negotiated in 1948.

These revisions were agreed upon in negotiations with some 34 nations which, together with our own country, conduct about 80 percent of the international trade in the free world. One of the most important documents our representatives signed was an agreement which would set up an Organization for Trade Cooperation to administer the general agreement. However, before this organization can become effective, it must be approved by Congress. And there, I suppose, we shall face another all-out battle by the tariff lobby.

The General Agreement seeks to establish some ground rules on trade among member nations, and they are sorely needed. In many cases tariff rates are not the most serious barrier to the flow of international commerce. Many other trade gimmicks can be employed which are even more effective in blocking our exports than a tariff would be. Among these protectionist devices are exchange controls, licensing restrictions, import quotas, and internal taxes on imports.

One of the main objectives of the general agreement is to bring about a decline in the use of these discriminatory weapons. In the 7 years since it was first negotiated, the general agreement has been instrumental in curbing the indiscriminate application of these economic weapons. In some cases we ourselves have gotten relief from discrimination after filing complaints based upon provisions in the general agreement.

One case involved the imposition by another nation of a nine percent sales tax on imported lumber, a tax from which domestic lumber was exempted. After we complained, the tax was applied to domestic lumber as well. In another case, an embargo on American potatoes was lifted by another country after we complained. A third case involved the efforts of the British to wean their population away from smoking pure Virginia cigarettes by requiring a 5 percent admixture of Oriental tobaccos. After several protests, based on provisions of the general agreement, the prohibition on the manufacture of unblended Virginia tobacco cigarettes was lifted. A score of other such cases exist—separately unspectacular for the most part, but impressive in total. It is doubtful that we would have gotten such redress in these cases in the absence of the general agreement.

As soon as H. R. 1 is passed, I believe it is imperative that we begin to work for congressional approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation to administer the general agreement. For we are the greatest trading nation in the world, and if we fail to ratify these accords, then the organization will fall apart.

I am convinced that isolation, in whatever form, political or economic, is no longer a safeguard for the United States, but a menace. We can no longer pretend that what we do is irrelevant to those who are with us in the grand alliance of free nations. Our economic position is so preeminent that what we do affects every member of the alliance. It is no longer possible for us to regard trade as solely a matter of domestic politics. Fortunately, we are in a position where our own economic interests and our world responsibilities converge in a trade policy that will permit an expansion of international commerce.

I do not regard the problem of developing an enlightened trade policy as one that we can take or leave alone, but rather as one that presses for an immediate solution. For, in the words of President Eisenhower, "If we fail in our trade policy we may fail in all."

Is the Working Family To Be Ignored in Present Administration Tax Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement, herewith are my views covering generally the present situation with regard to taxation.

I cannot bring myself to agree to the conference report on H. R. 4259, to be presented tomorrow for consideration.

To do so will cruelly deny modest tax relief designed to benefit the needy family in the lower income brackets, while at the same time the "fat-cat" Republican Revenue Act of 1954 will continue to drain off billions in tax benefits predominantly to large business, dividend recipients and wealthy individuals.

It is arrant fiscal irresponsibility, we are lectured from high administration places, to give modest tax relief to lower-income families—to give a direct tax saving of \$20 each to the father and mother and for each dependent child, so that the relief will be more effectively felt at the lower-income levels where the family burden presses the heaviest.

But—so goes the lecture from the same high administration sources—it is an act of high ennobled statesmanship, contributing to the welfare and stability of every humble home and fireside, to give unbounded tax relief to big corporations, coupon clippers, and wealthy individuals as was done last year in the Revenue Act of 1954.

I and other Members on my side of the aisle took the floor many times last year and this to protest the one-sided character of that 1954 act, particularly as to its dividend credit tax bonanza and its distorted and swollen depreciation tax allowances to corporations.

The dividend-credit provision of that 1954 act—the special-tax reduction for coupon clippers—will cost \$362 million a year. Eighty percent of that relief will go to the six-tenths of 1 percent of American families who own four-fifths of all publicly held stock. Ninety-two percent of American families own no stock and get no benefit. Less than 4 percent of all taxpayers—those with incomes over \$10,000—receive 76 percent of all dividend income. And eight-tenths of 1 percent of all American families—those with incomes over \$25,000—get 55 percent of all dividend income.

I ask, is it a token of fiscal responsibility that special-tax relief be accorded a favored limited group of dividend recipients—the unearned income class—but even most modest relief be denied the mass of taxpayers who work and toil for earned income?

The special depreciation allowances granted by last year's tax bill—thinly disguised special tax credits for in-

creased corporate dividends or favored capital-gains benefits to stockholders on corporate reinvestment of tax-free earnings—will continue to cost billions in reduced Federal revenues for a generation. Expert students of intricate tax maneuvers and business finance estimate that by the year 1960 the United States Treasury would be losing, at present levels of gross national product, about \$3 billion per year as a result of these new depreciation provisions if current tax rates on business remain the same. The same sources estimate that by 1955 the tax loss would rise to more than \$5 billion per year, and it would continue to rise thereafter. I commend to the attention of the Members the revealing study of Depreciation Under the New Tax Law, by Robert Eisner, published in the Harvard Business Review for January 1955, and reprinted in the RECORD of March 11 at page 2708.

But when the 1954 act was under consideration and even as of recent date, we were told in solemn assurance by the Secretary of the Treasury, and other administration fiscal pundits who now lecture us on fiscal irresponsibility, that these swollen depreciation tax benefits will really cost the Federal Government nothing. They say that if you view their tax effect on one piece of new machinery (and please limit your myopic view to only one added machine by the taxpaying corporation in this dynamic business economy of ours), then the Government will later get back the taxes it lost in the earlier years because no more depreciation tax allowances can be taken after the full cost of that single machine has been written off for tax purposes.

"Baloney," as a forthright statesman, dear to my memory, might have responded. The shallow assurance that the increased depreciation tax allowance "all washes out in the end"—to quote the study above referred to—"not only is misleading, it is to all practical purposes flatly erroneous." It mistakes the effect on a single piece of property for the cumulative tax effect, typical of American corporations, of increasing investment in new property additions each year in keeping with the economic growth of our system. Assume that gross additions of property are made at a constant rate each year by one of the big corporations in a heavy capital industry, if the properties last 33 years depreciation tax allowances under the generous new methods of last year will exceed tax writeoff under the old method in each of the first 27 years under one of the new methods and in every one of the first 33 years under the other new method authorized last year. The tax benefit does not "wash out in the end"; it can pile billions upon billions in reduced corporation taxes each continuing year for the next generation.

"When do we get back those billions?" I inquire after due heed to recent public sermonizing on fiscal responsibility. When I tried last year to find out from the Secretary of the Treasury, I ran into a stumbling block of refusal to give the information at first, then official stall, and finally airy assurance to the effect that "it all washes out in the end."

Not even the Wall Street Journal accepts the glib assurance of the Treasury that the new depreciation tax allowances "all wash out in the end." To quote from the lead editorial appraisal in the issue of March 28, 1955:

As shown here a few weeks ago, the depreciation change can produce large cumulative effects over the years. On any single piece of property the effect is minor. It merely postpones taxable income a few years by concentrating the depreciation in the early part of the life of the property. But as new facilities are built year by year, the relative weight of the early, heavy depreciation rates will keep growing, and Federal revenues will reflect this.

Yes; \$362 million a year of special tax benefits directly to stock dividend recipients—coupon clippers—and billions more per year in corporate tax benefits through tax-free depreciation allowances to be kept in company tills, distributed to stockholders, or reinvested with consequent increased stock values able to be realized upon at favored capital gains rate of taxation. In the eyes of "administration lecturers," that must be the acme of fiscal responsibility.

Relief for the wealthy, we are told, will stimulate investment and promote confidence. It will sustain that delicate maiden, whose confidence we must so tenderly nourish, the stock market boom. Relief for the needy, this administration tells us, must be spurned as phony and base political trickery. For the latter—for the needy—the weight of the tax load on their burdened backs will help spur their daily toil and assure heightened awareness of the precious price of citizenship.

Some other observers, perhaps lacking in self-righteous zeal for the current brand of fiscal responsibility, detect in this strutting fiscal conscience only the old hardpanned trickle-down theory again restored to its place of public eminence after years of brooding silence. I doubt that in our modern economy, sustained as it must be by mass purchasing power and ever-broadening distribution of the products of farm and factory, the trickle-down will be adequately or timely in rate of flow to promote the truly dynamic expanding economy that lies within our reach.

I urge disagreement to the conference report. I respect the views reluctantly reported by the majority members of the committee of conference. I know their sincerity, their deep conviction, and their persistent effort to gain acceptance of House action in passing the \$20 tax credit. Only under adamant threat of Presidential veto on the eve of expiration of current higher rates of corporate and excise taxes did they bow to Executive fiat.

But I am still mindful that our Founding Fathers wrote in the Constitution that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives" and to the Congress the Constitution gave the power to lay and collect taxes. Too often of late has this House—its elected Members—forsworn its rightful prerogative. Let us assert it now, confident in the human justice

and economic justice of our prior action, lest by failure to do so we embolden further the disciples of the McKinley era in their new onslaught of power and privilege. If we disagree to the conference report, then this House itself lifts the awesome responsibility from the individual shoulders of the able chairman of the conference committee and his fellow conferees. I doubt that the administration, despite its blustering threats, would rashly jeopardize by veto the true fiscal responsibility and fairness of our Government. The pages of history are studded with examples where human liberty and justice were won only by like defiance of entrenched power.

Farmers Who Lived Through the Last Depression Have No Difficulty in Supporting Full Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from a man in Florida who felt I was being inconsistent by coming out for full parity and the family-type farmer. Here is what I told him:

Through press of business I could not get to your letter until today, and I note you think I am inconsistent when I propose the farm bill, H. R. 748. It may seem so on the surface, but if you lived through the last depression when we spent untold millions on feeding people, reorganizing the banks, and, in fact, every business in the country, you will remember that this great depression started on the farms. In my State wheat was 26 cents a bushel, not enough to cover the cost of harvesting and threshing, and many farmers burned their fields. Stores out there were filled with goods, but the buying power was gone, and in turn manufacturers could not sell and factories closed. At one time there were 15 million people walking the streets for something to eat. WPA and PWA were set up to give jobs. In my State alone in some counties 72 percent of the people were on relief. It swept clean as the businessmen and banks went to the wall. Seventy percent of the banks in North Dakota, South Dakota, and elsewhere in the West closed.

I do not want this to happen again—but if it is necessary to educate the people further, we can let the farms go and no matter what business you are in, it will finally reach you. It will reach you if you have insurance policies or any kind of investments.

You will recall that in the debates on the old price supports, nothing was said about putting the farmer back on his feet, but all emphasis was centered on putting the whole country back on its feet. The plan worked and when the farmer could get a price his buying power returned and factories reopened and the jobless went to work. My principal business was farming at that time, and I lost all I had—\$150,000 and some more I had to earn and pay back later. I lost all my land, and when elected to Congress I had to borrow \$100 to get to Washington. I was not alone—if I had been I would have

concluded it was my fault, but all went down.

All parity means now or ever did mean was that a farmer should receive a price commensurate with what he has to pay out. You can see combines at \$2,000 (in those days) and wheat at 26 cents doesn't work and can't work. I never started farming again. I do raise livestock, and we used to get barbed wire for \$1.75 for 80 rods and 6 cents for our cattle. In the depression, wire went up and cattle down to \$12 per head for good cattle. We used to get good men for \$40 per month, and they worked. Now we pay \$250 a month and the work done is about 25 percent of what we received from \$40 men.

Parity means the farmer's selling price should be kept in line with his expense price.

Of course, if you want the small farms to disappear, schoolhouses vacant, and churches monuments to once happy communities, your views will bring that about. If you want all the farm people crowded into the cities to swell the ranks of labor, you are on the way. If you want them on relief rolls you will probably live to see it.

The farmers are blamed for everything. Those who buy bread now at 26 cents per loaf pay the price and then cuss the farmer all the way home. The fact is that this 26-cent loaf of bread will be the same price if wheat were selling for 75 cents per bushel instead of \$2.23. There is only 3½ cents' worth of wheat in a loaf of bread and the rest of the cost in labor, transportation, insurance, workmen's compensation, and security assessments. Just follow a loaf of wheat from Williston, N. Dak., to your table and see what happens. It is shipped to the grain terminals, and the freight bill must be paid; it is sold to millers, and commission men get a dig at the price—they have to insure the grain and pay their handlers. The millers buy the wheat, and again it is shipped—more freight and switching charges. It arrives at the mill and an immense herd of employees grind it up. They all have to be paid, they must have liability insurance, old-age security, and job insurance. The flour is turned out. It goes to wholesalers and more freight is added. More of this and that until it finally reaches your store. You buy the bread, but the local merchant has to pay rent or taxes; he has to pay his employees, who in turn have all the same demands that labor had on the railroads and at the mills. The merchants must add to the price enough to live on or go out of business, and when you walk home with that loaf of bread you have paid 3½ cents for the wheat and 22½ cents for the unending line of railroads, trucks, insurance companies, old-age security, liability insurance, and interest.

Of course, you get good and mad, but you can see that it is not the farmer you should be mad at.

There is only one way you can beat this game—and that is the way we had to do it in the early days of Dakota. We raised some wheat—it was not hauled by railroads, it was not milled by millers, it was not handled by wholesalers or local merchants—we ground it ourselves in a coffee mill if we could find nothing else. Made our own bread, and man alive, if I could buy a loaf of actual bread like that on the American Continent today, I wouldn't ask the price. We didn't put in plaster of paris to keep the bread fresh; we didn't bleach it to make it white; we didn't fill up the holes or bubbles in gluten wheat with water; we didn't add compounds, ingredients, acids, or other synthetic materials that are harmful to human life; we made bread and it was cheap in price, but so far superior to bread today that there cannot even be a comparison.

No; I think you are doomed to eat chemical bread, and I am not so sure that some smart guy may not come along some day and

offer synthetic wheat. If properly advertised, it will sell. I hope the North Dakota wheat raiser will then escape the cussing of the bread eaters of the Atlantic coast area.

I don't have time to write as fully as this to everyone, but I will mimeograph this letter and answer other thousands who are after my scalp because I want to maintain on this continent the family-type farm and maintain farm prosperity as the only insurance against another disastrous depression.

The Status of Forces Treaty Should Be Revised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to voice to the House my strong support of the resolution for the revision of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty. I cannot speak too urgently upon this subject.

This treaty may touch the lives of millions of Americans—and touch them intimately and cruelly. Every boy who enters the service—and every boy is subject to call, as long as the present military necessity demands it, every man in the military service of our country will be subject to it.

We are dealing today with a situation unprecedented in our history and foreign to our way of thinking. Our heritage rebels against it; our outlook for the future shrinks from its potential dangers.

The NATO Status of Forces Treaty would subject every American in uniform who commits an offense to trial in the courts of the country in which it occurs. Now, at first glance the full import of this situation may not be too startling. But the danger lies in the fact that there are tremendous differences between us and most of the other countries of the world. Not only are there barriers of language, differences of outlook, of background, and of training separating the individual and his accusers, but there are differences in the legal systems and in the methods of the courts abroad.

Only with the English-speaking countries do we share the common law system in the courts. Elsewhere the civil law or some other legal system prevails.

Now our boys who get into predicaments abroad, whether guilty or innocent, will be at a tremendous disadvantage. First, they will not know the language. Though they may have able interpreters, there will be differences in terminology, shades of meaning, idioms, and legal phraseology—the fine points of the law—that do not readily lend themselves to interpretation or translation. The accused will not usually be represented by counsel of his same nationality. For the lawyer as well as for the victim these differences will present grave difficulties.

Yet, so handicapped, the accused must defend himself in a foreign country,

where the atmosphere may be hostile, the citizenry inimical. Public opinion might well be against him, a man accused of crime against the country which may already resent his presence, along with that of his fellows, though they be there for the good of all.

Even in England, even there, where the court system has a reputation for excellence, a reputation for fairness, even in England he will be a foreigner indicted, and brought before a panel of—to him—foreigners.

The trouble does not end here. Though we now have concluded status of forces agreements only with the NATO countries and Japan, there will be other countries demanding similar treatment; other, less developed, less friendly countries, countries less conscious of the demand for an equitable court system, of the public demand for justice.

Here lies the crux of the matter: Will justice be done? Or, will there be a miscarriage of justice?

What will be the American reaction when our military forces are subject to these things? These men and boys who serve their country abroad, whether through their own will or through a draft system which carries them to foreign lands whether they want to go or not, will be subject to trial and imprisonment under conditions and rulings which are foreign to us in every sense of the word. The reaction of the families and friends of these men will be indignant and bitter. Sympathy for our relationships abroad will decline, and there will be increasingly reluctant compliance with the draft law at home.

To object to this treaty arrangement is not to condone misconduct, but it is to suggest a revision of the treaty, a renegotiation of it, particularly with respect to article VII. It is to suggest a return to the system which was in operation during World War II, whereby a military man accused of an offense would be tried by the military authorities of his own country, an American would be tried by Americans. The authorities responsible for his being abroad would be responsible, if he gets into trouble, for seeing that justice is done.

The resolution which I am introducing is aimed to accomplish this. It would eliminate article VII of the agreement. Its purpose is to bring this about so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American personnel stationed within their boundaries. It urges that all possible steps be taken by the Government of the United States to accomplish that purpose.

Protection Against Unprovoked Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would

give protection against unprovoked violence to all of the uniformed members of our Armed Forces.

The net effect of this bill is to make the unprovoked assault upon our military personnel a Federal offense, if committed while such personnel are engaged in the performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty. Persons charged with such assault could be tried in a Federal court. It would provide protection to all our servicemen and especially those servicemen belonging to minority groups, who in certain localities of our Nation might be the object of prejudice. It would extend the same protection to all wearers of the uniform of our country which we now extend to the Coast Guard, and to many other Federal officers and employees, ranging from marshals and game wardens to meat inspectors.

Police protection in many localities where we maintain large concentrations of servicemen is inadequate. We therefore must rely on military policemen, who, if they are to maintain order must be given adequate protection against bodily harm. This bill would assure that persons guilty of assault upon any of our military personnel on duty would be promptly apprehended and prosecuted. The Department of Defense has in the past formally endorsed this proposal. I hope and believe their endorsement will be forthcoming in this instance.

As we approach the consideration of any type of universal military training program or expanded Reserve program the need for such protection becomes more important.

It is my fervent hope that this Congress will give its swift consideration to providing the protection which our military personnel need.

Tabulation of a Poll on Questions of Current Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to report the outcome of a public-opinion poll conducted among voters of Indiana's 10th Congressional District.

This is the 5th consecutive year in which I have sought to obtain a cross section of public thinking on current national issues. In this 1955 canvass of citizens of east-central Indiana, a total of 6,501 marked ballots were tabulated. The results, I believe, are fairly indicative of the prevailing sentiments of voters in the Midwest.

Following are the recorded votes on 10 questions of current interest:

Ultimatum to Red China: Free United States prisoners or risk naval blockade. Favored, 4,301; opposed, 1,419.

Multi-billion-dollar Federal-State program of highway construction: Favored, 3,489; opposed, 2,146.

Three-year extension of reciprocal trade with United States tariff reductions: Favored, 3,716; opposed, 1,407.

Raising minimum-wage rate to 90 cents an hour: Favored, 4,020; opposed, 2,291.

Continuance of flexible farm-price supports: Favored, 4,038; opposed, 1,644.

Economic-military aid to free nations of Asia: Favored, 3,727; opposed, 1,651.

Federal aid to school-building construction: Favored, 3,062; opposed, 2,974.

Enactment of President's national reserve plan for military manpower: Favored, 3,721; opposed, 1,279.

Bricker amendment to limit treaty powers: Favored, 3,332; opposed, 1,530.

Increase in rates on air and first-class mail: Favored, 2,723; opposed, 3,060.

Tenth Anniversary of Arrest of 16 Polish Underground Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, if there is to be another conference with the Soviet Union, let our American leaders at that conference redress the following wrong. In accordance with the Yalta agreement the Moscow-sponsored provisional government of Poland had to be reorganized on a broader basis with the inclusion of leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad.

Mr. Molotov and the Ambassadors of the United States and Great Britain, residing in Moscow, were entrusted with the task to cooperate in the forming of a new government along above lines.

It was assumed from the very beginning by the American and British Governments that the most prominent leaders of the Polish underground, at that time hiding in Poland, would eventually enter the coalition. During the war they had fought in close cooperation with the Polish Government in London, a bitter struggle against the Nazi occupants and thus had largely contributed to the Allied war effort.

At the request of the British Secretary of State, the Polish Government in London disclosed for transmission to the committee in Moscow the names and whereabouts of the Polish Vice Premier and Government Delegate for the Homeland, and of the three members of the Home Council of Ministers. The Allied Governments gave assurance that they would do everything possible to insure the safety of the Polish underground leaders.

A short time after the Polish Vice-Premier, Mr. Jankowski and the last commander of the disbanded Home Army, General Okulicki were approached by Colonel Pimenov of the Soviet NKWD,

with a request to attend a meeting with Colonel General Ivanov, a representative of the high command of the I White Russian Front. This invitation was confirmed by letter, on March 10, to Mr. Jankowski and General Okulicki. The purpose of the meeting, in Colonel Pimenov's own words, was "the clarification of the atmosphere and the coming into the open of the democratic Polish parties in order that they may take part in the general current of the democratic forces of Independent Poland." Although absolute personal safety was granted by the Soviet representative—the 16 Polish underground leaders, when they arrived on March 28, 1945, at the meeting place—were arrested and flown to Moscow and imprisoned there.

The Soviets committed in cold blood another act of shameless felony. It was only on May 5, 1945, that the official Soviet agency TASS announced the arrest of the Polish leaders. This happened during the San Francisco Conference, and Molotov himself confirmed the news.

The British and the United States Secretaries of State expressed grave concern to Mr. Molotov and asked for full explanation. Their intervention remained nevertheless without response, and on June 18, 1945, a trial of the Polish leaders was held in Moscow by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U. S. S. R.

Following sentences were passed:

First. Maj. Gen. Leopold Okulicki, born 1898, commander of the Polish Home Army succeeding Gen. T. Bor-Komorowski, after the Warsaw rising; 10 years in prison.

Second. Jan Stanislaw Jankowski, born 1882, member of the Christian Labor Party and Vice Premier of the Polish Government in London, appointed delegate in Poland; 8 years in prison.

Third. Adam Bien, born 1899, member of the underground government, Peasant Party; 5 years in prison.

Fourth. Stanislaw Jasiukowicz, born 1882, National Party, member of underground government; 5 years in prison.

Fifth. Kazimierz Puzak, born 1883, leader of Socialist Party and Speaker of Underground Parliament; 18 months in prison.

Sixth. Alexander Zwierzynski, born 1880, National Party, deputy speaker; 8 months in prison.

Seventh. Kazimierz Baginski, born 1890, Peasant Party, deputy speaker; 6 months in prison.

Eighth. Stanislaw Mierzwa, born 1905, Peasant Party; 4 months in prison.

Ninth. Zbigniew Stypulkowski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party; 4 months in prison.

Tenth. Eugeniusz Czarnowski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party; 4 months in prison.

Eleventh. Jozef Chacinski, born 1889, leader of Christian Labor Party; 4 months in prison.

Twelfth. Franciszek Urbanski, born 1891, Secretary of Underground Parliament, Christian Labor Party; 4 months in prison.

Thirteenth. Stanislaw Michalowski, born 1903, Democratic Party; proved innocent.

Fourteenth. Kazimierz Kobylanski, born 1892, National Party; proved innocent.

Fifteenth. Jozef Stemler Dabski, born 1892, interpreter of Polish delegation; proved innocent.

Sixteenth. Antoni Pajdak, member of Socialist Party and of Underground Parliament; was not tried in public, and the sentence in his case, was not disclosed.

It is to be noted that in accordance with Soviet procedure the penal sentence is counted as from the day of arrest.

General Okulicki, Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Pajdak did not as yet return to Poland. Okulicki should be released on March 28, 1955. Jankowski should have been freed on March 28, 1953, and Jasiukowicz on March 28, 1950. According to information—Pajdak was sentenced by administrative decree to 5 years, and if so—had to be freed on March 28, 1950. It should be stressed that the fate of these four prisoners remaining in Soviet Russia is still unknown.

The remaining leaders were brought back to Poland after the period of their detention in Soviet jails had elapsed. Puzak and Mierzwa were rearrested in Poland, sentenced, and Puzak died in prison. Czarnowski, Urbanski, and Chacinski died in Poland—the fate of Bien is not known, as well as of Zwierzynski and Stemler-Dabski. Michalowski and Kobylanski acquitted during the Moscow trial, were again arrested in Poland and are detained in prison. Stypulkowski is in England and K. Baginski lives in the United States of America.

In connection with the 10th anniversary of this shameless act perpetrated on March 28, 1945, against the 16 Polish underground leaders steps should be taken to, first, ask for full information as to the fate and whereabouts of those four leaders still kept in Soviet Russia; second, demand their release from prison; third, insist on the liberation of the underground leaders who have been submitted to new ordeals by the Moscow-sponsored regime in Poland after their return from Russia.

Senator Gore Receives Cordell Hull Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 23, I had the privilege of participating in the ceremonies in New York City when our colleague, the Honorable ALBERT GORE, junior Senator from Tennessee, was awarded the first annual Cordell Hull award by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education.

The Committee on Foreign Trade Education is providing effective leadership in the vital field of bringing the Ameri-

can public to a greater awareness of the importance of a sound foreign trade policy to every citizen.

Senator GORE, who is a native of Cordell Hull's home town of Carthage, Tenn., is a very fitting recipient of the Hull award. Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the award citation, and a copy of an editorial concerning the award, from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

FULL TEXT OF CORDELL HULL AWARD

In recognition of his national leadership and the great tradition of public service he established in a career of more than half a century as Secretary of State, as a Senator and a Member of the House of Representatives, and in appreciation of his historic sponsorship of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., salutes Hon. Cordell Hull and inaugurates the annual Cordell Hull award for leadership in building United States foreign economic policy.

The 1954-55 award is made to Hon. ALBERT GORE, junior Senator from Tennessee.

Senator GORE wins the widest public commendation for his wholehearted adherence to the principles of his fellow townsman, Cordell Hull. Senator GORE's service in both the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate has found him in the forefront of those battling for a trade policy in the true national interest. Most notably he led the fight in 1954 to revive the proposed extension and liberalization of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements, when shortsighted political interests found it expedient to postpone consideration. Senator GORE is now the outstanding Senate advocate of a modern United States tariff-trade program.

Award made this 23d day of March 1955, by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc.

B. A. RITTERSPORN, Jr.,
Executive Director.

SENATOR GORE LEADS

With the Senate approaching action on tariff policy, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., has directed additional attention to the situation by naming the first winner of the Cordell Hull Award.

Cordell Hull was the chief architect of the reciprocal-trade agreement method in use since 1934. It was given only a 1-year extension of life last spring, and the extension now being considered barely squeaked through the House this spring. Decisions on some other matters of major policy can be delayed through appointment of a commission for further study, but in this case the method has already been used. The Randall Commission has reported, and the question comes to a showdown soon.

For the committee to make an award in honor of Cordell Hull is good. Presentation now is timely. Choice of the first winner is excellent.

ALBERT GORE, who has followed the Cordell Hull footsteps from the same Tennessee district to the House and then the Senate, has been named for his leadership in building United States foreign economic policy.

Senator GORE, like Cordell Hull, has become known among other Senators for his wide and deep knowledge of tariffs and for his skillful work on behalf of more international trade. He sees this trade across national boundaries as essential for prosperity of this Nation and for world peace. He considers trade to be a powerful weapon in advancing our methods of managing human affairs against communistic management.

Senator GORE is indeed a leader in forming our economic policy, and we hope there are others like him to claim this award in future years.

The Attack Upon Our Republican Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last fall certain prophets of gloom and doom charged that the Republican \$7.4 billion tax reduction and the tax-revision bill—H. R. 8300—favored the wealthy taxpayer and bore too hard upon the workingman. That charge was absolutely false. Those same prophets now claim that the tax bills of last year favored the taxpayer in the upper brackets and discriminated against the taxpayer in the lower brackets; therefore, their \$20 per person tax-cut proposal was only fair. The following breakdown demonstrates the falseness of their charges:

First. A 10-percent cut was made in the personal income tax for all individuals in the middle and lower brackets. That tax cut tapered off to less than 2 percent for the taxpayers in the 3 top brackets. The great majority of taxpayers—85 percent—are in the middle and lower tax brackets. Did that tax cut favor the rich?

Second. All excise taxes, with the exception of those upon liquor and tobacco, were cut from 25, 20, and 15 percent to 10 percent—a cut of \$1 billion to consumers. The working men and women of America and their families constitute 85 percent of the consumers of the Nation. Did that tax reduction favor the rich?

Third. The repeal of the excess-profits tax last year reduced taxes upon corporations \$2 billion. What did the corporations do with the \$2 billion? Every dollar of it was either paid out to the corporation stockholders or was plowed back into business expansion. Since 80 percent of all the stockholders in America receive less than \$5,000 per year income, the dollars that went to the stockholders did not go to the rich. And the dollars that went into expansion provided jobs for the 600,000 new workers that enter the American labor market each year. Can anyone claim then that the repeal of the excess-profits tax was for the benefit of the rich?

Fourth. The passage last year of H. R. 8300, the tax revision bill, established a favorable tax climate for American business and industry in which to expand. This created more jobs for the workingmen of America. Did the tax revision bill favor the rich?

On the basis of the facts, therefore, do the charges of the prophets of gloom and doom stand up?

A POLITICAL BAROMETER

Mr. Speaker, the recent attack upon the revised Federal Tax Code by the New Dealers in Congress, who—as a result of the election returns last fall—are again in the saddle, is a clear indication of what American businessmen can expect if the New Dealers take over the executive department.

Led by Congressman JERE COOPER, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Senators HUMPHREY and DOUGLAS, an attempt is being made to repeal the small tax easement upon dividend payments that was made in the new tax code. This was made as a start toward abolishing double taxation upon corporation profits. An attempt is also being made to repeal the new accelerated depreciation tax allowance provision. Both of these provisions were placed in the revised code to encourage business expansion, to provide an improved tax climate for business and industry that would result in the creation of new jobs for our ever-growing number of job seekers.

The revised tax code has already demonstrated its value, because it—more than any other one thing—stopped the downward trend last year and gave the lie to those prophets of gloom and doom who went around the Nation last fall spouting their gloom and doom prophecies. These same men are now in the Senate seeking to repeal the very provisions of the revised tax code that saved us from the predicted recession.

One and one-half million stay-at-home voters in Illinois and 30 million stay-at-home voters in the Nation were responsible for placing these New Dealers back in the saddle in Washington. These delinquent voters had better wake up before 1956, or it will be too late.

Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is the 134th anniversary of the independence of Greece. Under the leadership of Archbishop Germanos, on March 25, 1821, Greek patriots rose and overthrew their Ottoman overlords who had oppressed them for so long. The Greeks have always had to fight for their freedom. Fifteen years ago, Mussolini's legions found that Greek resistance was a hard nut to crack. It later took the full strength of Hitler's armed forces to invest the little peninsula that is Greece—and then only for a time, until the Greek people could help to bring about their own liberation. Hardly was Greek freedom reestablished when Communist-led forces attempted to seize the government. The world will not soon forget that it was the Truman Doctrine which helped the Greek people to stand fast, and with military and economic aid, to turn back and defeat the Communist challenge.

In 1949 I saw at first hand during a visit to Athens how the Greek people joined in the common fight against communism and poverty. Today Greece once again knows peace, and is making earnest beginnings toward a fuller economic life. There is no better symbol of Greek-American friendship than the

plains of Thermopylae, once arid but now blooming with rice fields. The Greek children brought garlands of flowers to the American point 4 reclamation expert who had helped in the project, and their elders erected a simple monument of marble to his memory—of the same quarry as the Parthenon marble.

Those Greeks who have immigrated to our country have contributed greatly to the richness of American life. They have brought with them the high tradition of western civilization suggested by such towering figures as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Sophocles.

In my home city of Milwaukee, thousands of good citizens proudly cherish their Greek ancestry. They have contributed much to our economic, social, and cultural life, and to the learned professions. In war their sons have served our country brilliantly. Two fine congregations attest to their religious belief.

May two of the world's oldest democracies—the United States and Greece—go on forever in friendly brotherhood.

Textile Business Reported Booming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a great cotton-producing area, I am naturally much concerned about the welfare of the American spinners of the cotton which our farmers produced.

I have been very pleased to note two recent news items which indicate that the southern textile industry is prospering, despite many loud cries to the contrary.

The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23 contains on page A2023 a statement by former Senator Charles E. Daniel, of South Carolina, which says "unheard-of prosperity is predicted" for South Carolina industry, and adds, in part:

Looking at textiles, I see more cause for hope and optimism this year than ever before. Like the other phases of our economy, the textile industry, which is the South's most important industry, has experienced a year of adjustment. With the remarkable expansion of textiles in South Carolina to one of the top areas in this industry in the world, we are working hard to keep our newly won position. We outproduce and outsell any State in this respect.

The New York Times of March 27 contains an Associated Press dispatch which shows that cotton spinning improved in February of 1955, and that production was well above February 1954, when there were few complaints about foreign competition. Under unanimous consent, I include this brief news item in full:

COTTON SPINNING UP—INDUSTRY OPERATED AT 142.5 PERCENT OF CAPACITY IN FEBRUARY

WASHINGTON, March 26.—The Census Bureau has reported that the cotton-spinning

industry operated during February at 142.5 percent of capacity on a two-shift 80-hour week basis.

This compared with 138 percent during January and with 128.1 percent during February last year.

Spinning spindles in place on February 26 numbered 22,402,000, of which 19,429,000 were active, compared with 22,495,000 and 19,282,000 on January 29 and with 22,897,000 and 19,656,000 on the last working day of February 1954.

Active spindle hours for spindles consuming cotton in February totaled 9,299,000,000, compared with 9,184,000,000 for January and with 8,697,000,000 for February last year.

Address by Hon. Robert B. Anderson,
Deputy Secretary of Defense, Before
the National Rifle Association of
America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following very fine speech made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, upon the presentation of a 19th century rifle by the National Rifle Association of America:

You have all honored me greatly this evening. Not only am I privileged to be your speaker, but you have seen fit to bestow upon me this beautiful work of the gunsmith's art in the early 19th century period.

I shall treasure this memento of our evening together—the more so because it has been presented to me by a friend and fellow Texan, Davy Crockett. I might add that I shall also respect the veiled hint its presence conveys, and accordingly shall make my speech rather shorter than longer. In all seriousness, however, let me say once again: I am honored by your invitation; I am deeply appreciative of the handsome object your kindness has bestowed upon me; and I am genuinely glad to be here with you.

In many respects, Davy Crockett and the long-barreled rifle are symbolic of a particular phase in American history deserving more attention than we tend to give it, for certain of its important elements have now returned to shape and form some of the conditions of our own existence here in the 20th century. For nearly 300 years, there existed somewhere in our country a live frontier, and a considerable number of our people lived intimately and continuously with its hardships and dangers. In the beginning, the wilderness lay just behind the tidewater settlements on the Atlantic Seaboard, so that in truth every resident was a frontiersman.

Later, our forefathers resolutely pushed the boundaries of civilization into the uplands of the Atlantic plain, then over the Alleghenies into the Mississippi Valley and beyond.

They reached the Pacific Ocean and then finally closed in from all directions upon the mountains, plains, and deserts of the western plateau. And always in the van were the hardy souls, both men and women, who braved the hazards of the known and unknown, and who endured their hardships and privations. Their fortunes, and quite often their lives, literally depended upon the readiness and determination with which they

were able to resist sharp and sudden attack, and upon the wisdom and stamina which they displayed in the presence of continuous danger.

Since well before the turn of this century, no American has had to contend with the historic problems of a live frontier. More than that, until a few years ago, we had little to fear from the possibility of attack by an external enemy. Thus blessed with the physical security of our homes and families in a way few other great nations had ever been, we tended to confuse a historical accident with a law of nature, and to suppose that freedom from danger was the rule, rather than an exception in human experience.

The events of the past 10 years have offered increasing proof that danger does indeed exist, that it is comprehensive and continuing, and could be virtually total in its implications. We are back again to the day of the live frontier; only today's frontier is not discernible as a ridge or a river or a tree-line.

It is as broad as the blue sky and as encircling as the sea coast, extending the length and breadth of our land. Perhaps not since 1607 could it be said that the total American community has been so eminently and equally exposed to the possible rigors of a hostile environment as it has come to be over the past few years.

So long as a few evil men have the power to threaten our security, we must in our turn learn to live under the shadow of danger, and we must prepare ourselves materially and morally to meet the exigencies which an uncertain future may present. We must retain the strength and readiness to meet any challenge, yet we must integrate our defensive preparations into our recipe for living in such a way that they do not displace the normal healthy preoccupations of a peacefully disposed people.

For us, maintaining combat readiness must not be an extraordinary adventure, but the routine response to unpleasant, but nonetheless persistent demands of possibility.

The maintenance of a people's readiness to meet the exigencies of a fluid and developing situation requires a continuing regard for certain aspects of whatever means are adopted. We must in reality be as much concerned with what things may become as we are with what they are as of a given moment. This in turn means that we must give great care to those influences which will bear importantly upon what we are able to do 1 year from now, 5 years from now, 50 years from now.

First, we are concerned, and vitally so, with the planning processes from which we are able to formulate the basic concepts for the employment of our resources to the best advantage of our defense. Policy can be no better than the planning which precedes it, and upon which it depends for its direction and meaning.

There is truth in the saying, "Who wills the end must will the means." It has no more intensive application than to the manifold processes by which the complex and massive political, military, and economic factors affecting our world situation are reduced at any given point of time to specific concepts, immediate plans, and current actions. We must maintain a continuous review of all these factors; we must constantly adjust our plans to be responsive to the inevitable changes which are sure to occur.

There is thus the need for flexible, responsive military concepts, capable of smooth and rapid adaptation to a variety of strategic situations—concepts looking constantly toward all foreseeable future developments.

Second, we are concerned with the military applications of our technology. Here we can spare no effort. The development of new weapons and techniques is a race whose stakes may be life and death. We cannot know the detailed plans of the evil few who

threaten world peace, so we cannot precisely gauge their progress in weapons technology.

But we do know that they are formidable opponents, capable of scoring technological break-throughs in major weapons systems which could have dire consequences for us.

Knowing this, we have no alternative but to press forward with all possible speed on the continued development of our own weapons. Not only is this true but we are determined that the American fighting man always has for his use the finest possible products of our science, technology, and production.

There is, finally, the all-important area of personnel. The best weapon in the world contributes nothing to the national defense in the hands of a man unable to use it.

The best conceived plan may fail for the lack of people with the capacity to execute it. Everything depends upon the man.

Our first attention must therefore be given to those measures which will insure a permanent nucleus of spirited, competent, highly trained, career military personnel in our Armed Forces. We need the best people we can get, both men and women, officer and enlisted.

Once they prove themselves worthy, we want to keep them. We want them to have a place of honor and respect in the community.

We do not want them to be unduly penalized by the personal hardships which in troubled times fall disproportionately upon them as a group.

In an effort to mitigate some of these undesired difficulties the Department of Defense has sponsored legislation before the present Congress designed to increase the availability of medical care to dependents, provide more and better family housing, relieve some of the financial handicaps of frequent and expensive moves, and granting selective pay increases according to a carefully scaled career incentive plan. I am indeed happy to note here that the legislation adjusting the military pay scale has been passed by Congress and was signed by the President yesterday afternoon. Within the limitations set by national security considerations, we are doing what we can to relieve the handicaps of necessary separations of families and loved ones. We hope by these measures and others to adjust certain inequities and to create a more satisfactory material basis for the careers of our service people; but we must see clearly that we are in no way able to "buy" their patriotism and morale. Most of our people are in the service because in spite of the difficulties and handicaps it imposes, it represents to them a way of life and an opportunity to serve their country.

They are the ones whose acts and lives give common currency to the uncommon expression "above and beyond the call of duty." They are the ones who not only stand ready to serve but do serve, directly and indispensably, in the one undertaking upon which all others depend for their meaning and significance—the physical and military defense of the United States.

They are the ones—the only ones—who can give meaning to the billions we have allocated to our defense, for the point always comes when the efforts of the homefront can exert no further influence upon the turn of a battle or a war. At that point the issue is delivered into the hands of those who have spent their lives in preparation for just such a moment, and the very life of the Nation may owe to the foresight, the skill, and the patriotism of those who recognized this truth in the easy years of peace and who made themselves ready to meet its fateful consequences.

If everything depends upon the man, it depends particularly upon the trained man. Armed forces exist in peacetime for little more than to train and ready themselves for the hard and uncompromising test of com-

bat. Life in the Armed Forces begins and ends with training, whether it be the simple Manual of Arms of the highly sophisticated studies pursued at the National War College.

There is individual training, unit training, technical training, training in the form of drills, exercises, maneuvers, and indoctrination. Daily thousands of aircraft rise in training flights, from the light primary trainers to the gigantic B-36's of the Strategic Air Command. The Navy relentlessly drills its crews in the tasks necessary to keep its ships at peak operating efficiency, with each able to discharge its part of the overall mission of assuring command of the sea. The Army and Marine Corps concentrate upon the multitudinous problems associated with land and amphibious warfare. Joint maneuvers and exercises among all services are regularly held and we have successfully conducted combined exercises with the forces of our allies on many occasions during the past few years.

There is a logic which sustains this incessant and burdensome routine—as clear and concise as the reality of life and death with which it is so intimately associated. In battle there is no time to rehearse the signals—to reflect back over the lessons half learned in some training base far removed in time and space.

The soldier can take into combat with him only that part of his experience which has become so firmly ingrained within him that it becomes second nature for him to act according to its teaching. Moments of great stress have the effect of expelling from his consciousness all but the stark objects of the battlefield within the range of what he can see and hear and feel—the enemy ahead, the man to his right, his leader, his pack, and his rifle.

In these moments his capacity to act—and hence his effectiveness as a soldier—depends upon that fraction of knowledge which has been drilled and hammered and pounded into his subconsciousness by months and years of constantly repeated training and practice. If his training has been ineffective, he becomes a cipher at a critical moment when his very life may be the forfeit of his unpreparedness. Moreover, a man in imminent peril of death can be held in place only by the strongest of moral compulsions—among them a conviction of the rightness and ultimate triumph of his country's cause, a desire for the respect and approval of his comrades, an abiding faith in his leaders, and confidence in his own ability to take care of himself. Any action which contributes to any of these basic determinants of human behavior means a more effective fighting man regardless of where he may be or what uniform he may wear.

Conscience, comradeship, and confidence are the indispensable to combat morale. All depend to a greater or less extent upon what a man knows and believes. What he knows and believes depends largely upon what he has been taught.

What I have just said relates most obviously to those who wear the uniform in our active forces. But it relates no less to our Reserves and to those who may wear it at some future time. Our Nation has in the past and will continue in the future to rely upon its civilian armed components for effective defense in periods of general emergency.

This has meant in the past, and it may mean in the future, that the young man at the corner grocery dons a uniform and takes his turn in some grim quarter where there is no second chance, and where the price of his failures and inadequacies may be exacted in flesh and bone and blood.

As you know, the President, in a special message to Congress on January 13, 1955, recommended a 5-point national reserve plan to strengthen our Reserve Forces. For the past 2 months a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, under the

chairmanship of Congressman Brooks, of Louisiana, has labored tirelessly in its study of legislative proposals in support of the President's program.

The subcommittee, deeply conscious of its responsibility to the Nation, has evolved legislation which represents a great forward stride in providing the kind of Reserve needed in these perilous times. We are hopeful of early congressional approval of the national reserve plan, with all its principal provisions, which will provide us with the means for developing effective Reserve Forces.

The national reserve plan deserves your understanding and support. It is one of the most essential parts of our effort to work toward peace from a realistic position of strength.

Never have we had a greater need for an effective, highly trained, readily available Reserve, nor was the need ever more urgent for men who, in General Pershing's laconic phrase, "can shoot and salute." There is a continuing need for the fully developed capability of all the services. Each has an indispensable place in our total military posture, as we strive to make the most out of our resources. The defense of our country is a job deserving and needful of the efforts of all our people. In an age when the price of survival may demand the total effort of the Nation, our success or failure will depend upon the willingness of our citizens to concern themselves actively with the measures for our defense, not only in the Regular Forces, but in their everyday lives as civilian members of the national community.

Here we enter an area in which the National Rifle Association has since 1871 rendered a distinctive, deeply appreciated service to our country. For our citizen soldiers to be effective in an emergency there must be a large repository of shooting skills within the civilian population. The development of these skills is the objective of your organization. Toward that objective you have patiently and consistently labored for some 84 years. I cannot express how pleased I was to learn of your newest contribution—your sponsorship with the United States Marine Corps, of a training program for the improvement of marksmanship among volunteer members of the Marine Corps Reserve.

This is but the latest of many efforts which manifest your continuing interest in the promotion and improvement of marksmanship training both within the armed services and among interested civilian groups.

On behalf of the Department of Defense, let me say that we are sincerely grateful.

In your 84 years you have contributed greatly to the safe and productive exercise of a basic right of American citizens: the right to keep and bear arms.

It is a right exclusive among free peoples. Nowhere except in a free country, where the people share a common love of liberty, could the political authority tolerate the possession and use of firearms by the citizenry.

Of its very nature, totalitarianism requires a state monopoly of all instruments of force. Organizations such as yours would be proscribed, and its members suspect.

But here in America, we have the situation in which your activity constitutes a positive force on the side of the Government, for you are directly contributing to the development and spread of one of the most basic military skills necessary to its defense.

Throughout our history, the trained rifleman has ever been a mainstay in our struggles for independence and security in a world which has not yet found its way to an orderly existence.

We must continue to rely upon him in the future, just as we must rely upon your efforts to improve his competence and readiness. As we look back upon the lives of those courageous and resourceful Americans who wrested an empire

out of the wilderness, we are able to see that the efforts they made and the hardships they endured were part of the price they paid for the ultimate objective of peaceful, stable community, in which men under just law would be free to apply their energies to a rich new land, bringing forth its fruits in ever increasing measure.

Even as we face the challenge to our own lives, we are able to see the same purpose emerge in the vastly larger context of our modern world. For we, too, pursue the ultimate objectives of peace and stability on a worldwide scale—under which men may in justice and freedom direct their marvelous creativeness into constructive channels for the betterment of mankind. The frontiers of our 20th century are the limitless frontiers of the human mind, and it is in the widening and deepening of the possibilities for man's material and spiritual well-being that our best hope lies and toward which our efforts must be dedicated.

Let us, then, look to our new frontiers, as the Davy Crocketts, the Daniel Boones, the Kit Carsons and all the others looked to theirs in days gone by: with courage and resolution, and the faith in our own capacity to prosper and grow in the face of an uncertain and seemingly hostile environment.

Let us do so with the confidence bred of the knowledge that it was the very act of surmounting the awesome challenges of the past that has made us the great Nation that we are and must continue to be if freedom is to prosper in our world.

Local Service Airlines Should Receive Permanent Certificates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a statement made on behalf of Central Airlines, Fort Worth, Tex., some time ago:

Central Airlines of Fort Worth, Tex., has been serving Duncan, Okla., for over a year. This air service has been most valuable to the Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. as we have many employees who ride Central, making connections with other airlines for trips throughout the United States and many foreign countries. We send much of our mail by air and this helps to expedite our communications with customers and our field personnel. We have many calls daily for materials to be sent on a short notice. These materials consist of manufactured products, tools, etc. They are sent by airfreight in order that we might have as little delay as possible in receiving the materials in our various operating points. The certificate that Central has been operating under is not of a permanent nature and we earnestly solicit your help in giving Central all aid possible in granting them a permanent certificate.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of a permanent certification for local service air carriers. This statement is typical of statements of many of my constituents in behalf of permanent certification for local service air carriers. I am for the certification, both Central Airline and other lines seeking such certification.

The National Cotton Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the National Cotton Council met in Washington last month to discuss the council's position in regard to the cotton export trade. The leaders of the council decided that this organization could not properly become involved in a controversy involving export price policy for cotton.

At the same time the council reaffirmed its belief that maintaining a high level of international trade and a wider distribution of goods and services throughout the world is vital to the continued prosperity of the cotton industry and to the national economy, as well as to the security of the free world. The council recognizes that the greatest opportunity to expand United States exports of cotton and cotton products is through increased per capita consumption of cotton goods over the world.

The National Cotton Council represents all segments of the cotton industry—producers, ginner, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers, merchants, and spinners. Naturally conflicts of interest develop among these groups and differences over price policy can never be satisfactorily reconciled. President W. T. Wynn and the other leaders of the council were wise in their decision to avoid involvement in such conflicts.

The basic purpose of the council is to help increase the efficient production of cotton. Under Mr. Wynn's leadership the council expects to expand its efforts to encourage general economic development, advertising, and sales promotion, market research and development, and more efficient production and distribution of cotton products throughout the world. Such a program will be of primary benefit to the American cotton producer.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial concerning the work of the cotton council from the March 1955 issue of

the Progressive Farmer, the South's outstanding farm publication:

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE COTTON COUNCIL

In 1939 when the National Cotton Council was organized, cotton was a sick industry. It was losing out to its competitors. Rayon, the first of the synthetic fibers, was capturing its markets. In United States stores, cotton goods had been pushed into the bargain basements. On the farm, both cotton yields and quality were unsatisfactory; production costs were excessively high, due to heavy use of hand labor. All in all, the outlook for cotton was dismal.

Once organized, the council had to choose between two broad objectives. It could follow the lead of the butter industry, which for many years sought a way out of its troubles by imposing Government restrictions on its competitor. Or it could meet competition (1) by promoting a program of better cotton at lower cost, and (2) by developing new uses and new markets. Fortunately, it chose a constructive program of building up cotton in preference to one of tearing down rayon and other synthetic fibers. This basic choice has set the pattern for its program over the years. And with such a program the council has developed a proved formula for success.

Now, 16 years later, what is the situation? Cotton has a new outlook. It has confidence in a bright and shining future. It believes that it has no problem that can't be whipped by the industry cooperation in a program of research, education, and promotion.

Summing up its regeneration, cotton can point proudly to these accomplishments:

1. It has expanded its domestic market by 50 percent in the face of ever-increasing competition from synthetics. Losing heavily in some uses, such as bags and tires, it has more than offset these losses by large gains in wearing apparel and other fields. It has triumphed because it has won more market battles than it has lost. Cotton, once considered the poor man's fiber, is now equally at home in high society.
2. It has stopped the downward trend in exports that started in the middle twenties, and hopes to turn exports upward.
3. United States farmers have outdistanced foreign competitors in improving production practices.
4. The quality of United States cotton has been improving constantly. Fiber strength has increased 13 percent.
5. Man-hour requirements, for producing cotton have been cut in half; lint yields increased 30 percent.
6. Mechanization has come so fast that 22 percent of the 1954 crop was harvested with machines.
7. The cotton industry, from farmer to spinner, has a vastly improved spirit of mutual understanding. Its leaders have been meeting around conference tables for 16 years and have developed an immense stockpile of know-how.

thankful for men—"Men who in their inmost souls are true and honest; men who do not fear to call sin by its right name; men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole; men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall."

Wilt Thou, Father, the source of Daniel's and Joseph's wisdom and unrivaled statesmanship, bless our President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and each individual Senator, with wisdom, courage, and Thy presence, to the extent that their deliberations and decisions may be the outworking of Thy will. We ask it in the worthy name of Jesus. Amen.

The council would be among the first to admit that it cannot claim credit for all that has happened in the world of cotton during the last 16 years. Its first duty has been to get others to work harder and more enthusiastically for cotton—and to help them work more effectively. The council does not operate its own research laboratories. It investigates to see what research is needed. Then it works to obtain the needed expansion in research. And it follows a similar strategy to obtain needed educational work for getting research findings into use.

The cotton council is the joint effort of six groups—growers, ginner, cottonseed crushers, warehousemen, merchants, and spinners. Most outstanding is the success of the council in getting the majority of people in each of these groups to contribute to its financial support. On an average, about 70 percent of all 6 branches of the cotton industry is now making a financial contribution to the council.

Knocking Ike Is Grist for GOP Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the admirers of President Eisenhower in both parties will resent the attacks on our present Chief Executive, particularly when they center on wholesome diversions like fishing and golfing—as distinguished from poker-playing, weekend cruises—which are about the only relaxation a hard-working President can count on.

And when such partisan attacks bring the President's wife into the picture and include their religious devotions, then it is generally agreed that the American electorate will simply bide their time until such ill-mannered diatribes can be repudiated at the polls.

The attitude of the average Republican is to wait with bated breath for fear that the opposition will realize the mistake they are making and call off the attack before it can be of benefit to the GOP next year. And it can only be presumed that they have forgotten just how much the Republicans served the cause of Franklin Delano Roosevelt by making him the object of their partisan tirades each time he ran and thereby assuring his reelection.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

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

Elder Everett H. Shull, of the Potomac Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, offered the following prayer:

Loving Father in Heaven, we sense our complete dependence upon Thee for qualifications commensurate to the task before us. In this atomic age of great issues, of shadow and perplexity, we are

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., March 30, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MURRAY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.