Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend its air-parcel-post rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6126. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 6127. A bill to authorize sale of up to 250,000 cubic feet of helium to C. H. Propst for use in an airship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 6128. A bill to authorize sale of up to 250,000 cubic feet of helium to C. H. Propst for use in an airship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6129. A bill for the relief of Ramon Tavarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6130. A bill for the relief of Elisa Martinez-Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 6131. A bill for the relief of Annetta N. Thalassinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6132. A bill for the relief of Georgina Mercedes Llera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6133. A bill for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 6134. A bill for the relief of Dora Claire Lynch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6135. A bill for the relief of Jude Anthony Branch (Koji Aoyagi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6136. A bill for the relief of Ralph Wilson Reid, Eleanor Mary Reid, Marguerite Fay Reid, John Wilson Reid, and Robert Wilson Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6137. A bill for the relief of Herman Floyd Williams, Bettie J. Williams, Alma G. Segars, and W. C. Segars; 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:

239. By Mr. GATHINGS: Petition of several members of the First Methodist Church of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

240. Also, petition of Mrs. Dayton Sackett and others of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

241. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Oxford Pomona Grange, Maine, that the Congress of the United States enact legislation that will declare the grange a nonprofit organization and not be obliged to contribute to the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, or to any similar organization, where they are holding dances and other entertainments for the social and financial support of the grange; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

242. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Worcester, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the enactment of a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

243. Also, petition of the secretary, the Student Government, the City College of New York, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of a bill providing for Federal scholarships and loans to college students now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

244. Also, petition of Frank Salamone and others, New York City CIO Council, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the Federal minimum wage be increased to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

245. Also, petition of Victor M. Ortiz and others, New York City CIO Council, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the Federal minimum wage be increased to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

246. Also, petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, Bettendorf, Iowa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to inquiring relative to a redress of grievance involving his attainder petitions, Nos. 87 and 119, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foreign Policy in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on April 13 my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] delivered a very interesting address concerning our foreign policy in the Pacific at the Democratic fund-raising dinner at San Mateo, Calif. Because this subject is of such extreme interest to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE DULLES DILEMMA

I have come to you this evening to make a brief report on foreign policy in the Pacific—a policy which summed up is the Dulles dilemma. It is a dilemma vitally—maybe mortally—important to us on the Pacific coast. It is also, like any dilemma, frighteningly confused—in this case more than usual because of a last-minute discovery by Mr. Dulles of a paper tiger—a tiger which he claims to be this country but which many feel is merely this country's Secretary of State.

In a consideration of foreign policy of the United States, there is one all-important point to remember. We are told of the administration-Republican foreign policy—of the Democratic foreign policy and of the bipartisan foreign policy. The administration-Republican foreign policy can only be defined if you name the day and define it.

Of the Democratic foreign policy we have a clear idea indelibly written in history of which we are inordinately proud; of the bipartisan foreign policy we have no idea whatsoever. You first must decide which fraction of the Republican Party you will bipartisan with. However, none of these policies are the American foreign policy. The American foreign policy can only be decided by the American people themselves—people such as you who I am addressing tonight. It is you who must and shall set policies of the United States—domestic or foreign. To do this, you must be appraised of the facts—of the choices before us and their dangers.

I have come tonight to tell you as many of these as I have time for so that you can help dissipate both the Dulles dilemma and the paper tiger.

To begin with—to you as Democrats—as one of your Democratic Senators, I want to say that there was never anything wrong with the basic Democratic foreign policy set down by Truman and Acheson. It was the policy of containment—the policy of implacable opposition to aggression. The Communists understood it that way and respected it. Today the Republican Party is trying its best to get back to it as quickly as possible. In fact, the heart of the Dulles dilemma is how they can get back without having the Democrats say, "I told you so"—without the Communists putting us behind an iron curtain instead of us keeping them behind one.

For campaign purposes purely, the Republican Party today is making a terrific ado about two things. First, they are claiming that the Yalta Agreement was the original sin so far as the Orient is concerned. From it they claim stem all the problems of China, Korea, Indochina, Matsu and Quemoy, and Formosa. Second, they say that the only way we can possibly extract ourselves from our present dilemma is to trust implicitly in the clear judgment of our military leaders—the foremost of whom is our President.

With this we must take emphatic exception. Our present situation has been caused to a large extent by too great dependence upon the judgment of our military leaders. After the Second World War we found, as did the old Tiger of France Clemenceau after the First, that "War is too serious a matter to be left entirely to the generals."

Regardless of its merits, the Yalta Agreement was signed by President Roosevelt at the insistence of the military leaders of the Republican leaders in the United States Senate in order to shorten the war and to save 500,000 American lives.

That the military leaders were dead wrong, that they miscalculated our strength, the devastating effectiveness of the atomic bomb and the capacity of our scientists and industry to make bombs, is the tragedy of Yalta—if tragedy there is.

You have heard of the insistence of our Joint Chiefs of Staff that we must get Russia to take an active part in the Pacific in order to save our boys. What you probably have not heard is what the Republican Party itself was saying at the time. I have in my hand a speech given on the Senate floor at this time by Senator WILEY of Wisconsin, one

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

of the ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Here is what he had to say:

"Why then should we pussyfoot with our Russian ally and not declare only that we want them to make common cause in the Pacific? Why then should we not strengthen President Truman's hand by making known this desire from here at home in no uncertain terms? * * *

"Why should we act like helpless milktoasts when we have vast financial and other bargaining power to use as pressure on Russia? Why should we follow the lead of the 'nice Nellies' of our State Department who have been more concerned with diplomatic niceties than with the preservation of American interests and lives? * * *

"Thus America has everything to gain and thousands of her boys' lives to lose unless Russia joins in the Pacific struggle. * * *

"I would be remiss in my obligations as a United States Senator if I did not voice, in all humility but with all the force at my command, the feeling of millions of Americans that Russia do her part in the Pacific."

Our second great example of military judgment occurred in Korea. We undertook Korea with the complete support of the Congress of the United States. We undertook our responsibilities instantly. I know because it happened that I was at Blair House, the White House at the time, the evening we took that action. Republicans, Democrats, military staffs all agreed that this action was imperative and confirmed it next day.

In Korea we fought a confined, highly successful and—to begin with—not an excessively costly war, up to the great error in military judgment. We had rolled the North Koreans back to their own borders when the military decided they would push on to the Yalu. You remember that incident. The Chinese said: "If you do, we will get into this ourselves." The military leaders said, "We don't believe you. You can't and you won't." So they crossed over into North Korea. They pushed to the Yalu and they were wrong. Not only did the Chinese Communist armies get into the fight, they pushed us clear down to the southernmost tip of Korea and cost us the long and bloody war that followed.

This is the war that the Republican Party promised to end if they were reelected and they did. They ended it in a way President Truman could have ended it at any time—by surrendering.

You will remember when your San Francisco newspapermen interviewed a dejected Gen. Mark Clark when he came home from that surrender. They asked him why we gave up airfields and island that were strategic. He answered, "I guess because they wanted them." The Washington papers characterized it as the "voice of the mouse" and the first surrender in American history.

After Korea comes the third great example of military judgment—Indochina. Mr. Dulles and every expert on Asia said that once the Communits armies were freed in northern China they would move down to southern China and attack Indochina. They reported that these armies were moving in that direction—that they were building up for an invasion. Finally they did invade.

No preparations were made by our Government to meet this invasion. We closed our eyes and hoped it wouldn't happen. We refused to pour in arms and assistance to our allies as we had in previous wars. We left them helpless quarry of the red snake. But we did trust in the military appraisal of the situation. This was that the defenses of the French could stand without us—that the strategy of Dienbienphu would be successful. Well, it wasn't.

Mr. Dulles said that Indochina was absolutely necessary to the defense of the whole of southern Asia. You remember the statement that all southern Asia would fall—like a house of cards.

He went to Geneva to say that we were going to be tough. We made promises to the French and moved our aircraft carriers into the gulf to back him up. But he held a news conference just the night before the Geneva meeting and said, "Well, of course, he didn't mean it." That was the time they cartooned him as rushing to Geneva but leaving his head behind.

You can see what Clemenceau meant when he said that war is too serious a matter to be left entirely to the generals.

Today we must make another fateful decision. Whether to defend Quemoy, whether to use atomic bombs. The military tell us that the Chinese cannot withstand our first assault—that Russia will not back up China. But don't forget that if they are once again wrong and Russia does keep her treaties and back up China, we are in for a major war.

In digging up Yalta as a campaign issue, the Republicans are hoping to attract our attention from their two surrenders and their bumbling foreign policies.

In passing we might also point out that if Yalta is the original sin in the Pacific—the refusal to follow Prime Minister Churchill's advice and enter Europe through the Ljubljana Gap into the Balkans gave eastern Europe to the Communists—and in that the President cannot say he had no part.

The first step toward our present dilemma in the Pacific was taken on February 2, 1953, by President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message. In the Republican campaign for votes, regardless of truth or national safety, that party turned its back upon the policy of containment for one they described as broad and daring. It was not the containment but the liberation of Communist China. In line with it, the President unleashed Chiang Kai-shek. Said the President:

"There is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. This order implies no aggressive intent on our part, but we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea."

It sounded comforting, but it was the first roar of the paper tiger. I knew—I had been in Formosa. The military knew and the Communists knew that Chiang Kai-shek had no army worth unleashing. It was like unleashing me in the ring with Marciano next month. The operations of our 7th Fleet did not change; they flew and sailed the same patrols.

But it certainly gave Communist China something to think about. They looked upon Chiang's 50,000 men on Quemoy and his increasing fortifications, not as far from their mainland as Oakland is from San Francisco and decided they should do something about it. They announced they were going to drive the Nationalists out of these islands and out of Formosa too, by the way.

As for the defense of Formosa, we are all firmly, unanimously, and wholeheartedly committed to that adventure. Last January—lest China or the world have any doubt as to our determination and provoke a war by accident—we made it brilliantly clear by passing the Formosa resolution in the Senate. We gave the President no new powers, but we did confirm our unhesitating support of his constitutional powers.

We made it clear that the American people would make war against China or any other nation if such a course was thought essential to national safety; that we did not favor waiting supinely until attacked but were drawing a line—a distant line—which we would not permit to be crossed by a hostile force.

There is a fraction of the Republican Party—and your Senator KNOWLAND is among them—that do not think this goes far enough. They believe that China must be liberated, that the Communists must be utterly crushed—atomic bombed to surrender, and that such a bloody course is essential not only to world peace but our own survival. In this they have the ears of the administration—the support of the generals. Their demands for preventative war furnishes the only reason for the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. We must realize this and take our part in this debate. If these two inconsequential islands, as some Senators claim, are invaluable as a springboard to launch a full-scale war to liberate China, then the American people should know that this is their value. They should know the cost. It is no matter for secret deliberation and decision.

What devilish, ghastly irony it would be for all of us here on the Pacific, if after so emphatically eliminating the chance that China accidentally set off a world war because she did not clearly know our intentions, we ourselves set off one because we did not believe the Chinese and Russians.

I have been to Formosa several times. I have listened to the debates and I believe it is clear beyond a reasonable argument that these offshore islands are in no sense essential to the defense of Formosa. Arguments to the contrary are almost frivolous. As the New York Times says, "It is almost like arguing that the loss of Staten Island—a ferry boat ride from Manhattan, would jeopardize the defense of Bermuda."

Two reasons are given for our defending these islands to the bitter end. The first is that if we don't we will be considered a paper tiger. The second that if we lose them, Chiang's troops will lose their morale and might even defect.

As to the paper tiger, he was discovered by Mr. Dulles himself and described to the Nation in a speech upon his return from the Bankok conference on March 8. He said we must not make any further concessions that would lend support to the Communist charge that the United States is such a flismy animal.

It is useless for us to protest now that Mr. Dulles should have thought of this eventuality before the administration unleashed the noneffective Nationalist armies, before he declared "massive retaliation."

There is no use of my pointing to the speeches I have made on the floor of the Senate—and Senators LONG, JACKSON, etc., have made—protesting Mr. Dulles' policy and predicting its inevitable outcome. He has most certainly brought it on himself. All I can insist upon is that the paper tiger is not the United States—but the Secretary himself and an administration that has put political expediency before wise and courageous action.

As to the humor of Chiang's troops—to this end we can scarcely risk atomic war—justify the millions of inevitable casualties and back up an army that can get no fresh recruits or reenforcements except from ourselves.

If we defend Quemoy, it will mean the use of small atomic bombs. It will mean that we will fight with only two allies—Chiang and Sigmund Rhee. Even Canada has said it will refuse to come along. If the Russians keep the mutual defense treaty with China it will mean submarines, planes, and even small atomic bombs to resist us. Only one hydrogen bomb on Formosa would end all of this dilemma for eternity. It is just the right size for such a bomb.

It is my opinion that it is high time we end this dilemma. Let us with protests, votes, and every means at hand, make it crystal clear to the White House that we want no part of these offshore islands. That we want no part in experiments with atomic warfare that is cheap in money but astronomically costly in human life.

Let us also demand an end to the bumblings of our State Department—to the put-

ting of politics before wise policy and money before national defense.

We must, as the administration said it would do 3 months ago, introduce clarity and certainty into our relations with the Chinese Communists and the whole world. We must let America be America—have an American foreign policy which is a fearless Christian foreign policy.

As to this in conclusion, I would like to point out that world events are showing us that even our democratic policy of containment may not be enough. We live in a day when the underprivileged of the world are on the march demanding equality of opportunity, freedom from economic exploitation, and the enjoyment of a better life. The Communists are capitalizing on this to the ultimate enslavement of nations. Until we can capitalize upon it too, and bring hope to these people of a new and fresh day, we will really have no effective American foreign policy.

If only they had a faint ray of hope that they might enjoy a pitiful little of what we enjoy they would never become Communists. Every one of us here wants them to have not only the hope, but to actually have what we have. For that we would gladly fight in the American tradition—to make them feel it, know it, and to realize the benefits of it, must be your American foreign policy.

University of Wisconsin To Honor Three Distinguished Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to know that at the commencement ceremonies of the University of Wisconsin on June 17 next, three distinguished Americans will be honored.

There are a noted labor leader, Jacob F. Friedrick; a famous architect, Wisconsin's world-renowed Frank Lloyd Wright; and a great women leader, Mrs. Lillian Gilbreth.

Each of these outstanding Americans well deserves the plaudits which will be given them.

In the April 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as appears on page 4892, I personally paid tribute to Frank Lloyd Wright at the time I had reprinted an NBC radio interview and a Diplomat magazine interview with him.

Mrs. Gilbreth, a famous wife of a famous husband, has been part and parcel of the whole new science of industrial engineering which she and the late Frank Gilbreth pioneered in this country.

I should also like to say just a word about Jacob Friedrick, not only is he an universally respected leader in the ranks of labor, but he is held in greatest admiration in the community, as well, and throughout all segments of Wisconsin life.

The honor which will be accorded to Mr. Friedrick at the University symbolizes the honored new role of American labor. Time was when labor, in its legitimate efforts to organize, in order to achieve a higher standard of living, was smeared and denounced. Labor leaders of the highest patriotism were treated as if they were "Red revolutionaries," simply because they sought the right of the workingman to bargain collectively.

But now, fortunately, that unhappy day has passed. Labor has come into its own. There is no field of community or patriotic endeavor in which the leaders of organized labor do not contribute alongside the leaders of every other section of society. So I am delighted that this fine AFL spokesman is to receive honor at the hands of my alma mater.

I send to the desk an article published in the Saturday, May 7, Milwaukee Journal, announcing the intention to award the three honorary degress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN TO HONOR LABOR LEADER—FRIEDRICK NAMED WITH FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT AND MRS. GILBRETH

A Milwaukee labor leader, a world famous Wisconsin architect, and a noted woman author and industrial consultant will be awarded honorary degrees by the University of Wisconsin at commencement ceremonies in Camp Randall stadium, Madison, at 5 p. m., June 17.

University regents Saturday confirmed degrees for:

Jacob F. Friedrick, general secretary-treasurer of the AFL Milwaukee Federated Trades Council. Doctor of laws.

Architect Frank Lloyd Wright, of Spring Green, Wis. Doctor of fine arts.

Mrs. Lillian Moller Gilbreth, of Montclair, N. J., president of Gilbreth, Inc., construction engineers in management and currently Knapp visiting professor of mechanical engineering at the University of Madison. Doctor of science.

Friedrick, 63, is one of the most highly respected labor leaders in Wisconsin. He has been cited as the model of the self-educated man who has worked selflessly to enable others to benefit by education. He has been called the man most responsible for the strong support given the University of Wisconsin by the Wisconsin labor movement. Friedrick came to America from his native Hungary when he was 13. His formal schooling was limited to an eighth grade education plus a year and a half at what is now Boys' Technical High School. He joined the AFL International Association of Machinists in Milwaukee in 1913, almost immediately became an active unionist and rapidly moved up in the local IAM organization.

WAS REGIONAL DIRECTOR

From 1935 to 1945, Friedrick was general organizer of the Federated Trades Council. For the next 6 years he was AFL regional director here. He then became general secretary of the trades council, the county central AFL body, and last Wednesday became general secretary-treasurer of the council with the formal abolition of tne separate treasurer's post.

Friedrick is chairman of the city sewerage commission and has been a member of the advisory committee of the University of Wisconsin's school for workers since its inception and a member of the State industrial commission's advisory committee on unemployment compensation since 1932.

LEAVES MARK AROUND WORLD

Wright, 85, has been widely recognized as one of the great creative artists of the century. After more than a half century of architectural pioneering, he has left his unique mark on landscapes around the world. Born at Richland Center, Wis., Wright studied civil engineering at the University of Wisconsin in the middle 1880's and in 1887 went to Chicago where he became an apprentice of the late Louis Sullivan, one of the architects in American history.

The Imperial Hotel in Tokyo was only the first of the daringly original buildings that brought Wright world recognition. Some 500 buildings around the world, each representing a new facet of Wright's genius, are testimony to his pioneering.

Wright in 1911 built Taliesin ("radiant brow" in Welsh) at Spring Green, Wis. Wright since 1932 has trained young men in his architectural methods at Taliesin East, which he has, thrice rebuilt after fires, at Spring Green.

Only last year, Wright said he would leave Wisconsin after the State supreme court ruled that the foundation that runs Taliesin was not tax exempt. Wright later relented.

During his long career, Wright has been accorded numerous honors. Among them are honorary degrees from Wesleyan, Princeton, Temple and Yale universities, Florida Southern college, and an award from the University of Venice.

Mrs. Gilbreth's fame has been spread in two books, "Cheaper by the Dozen" and "Belles on Their Toes," written by 2 of the 12 Gilbreth children. Mrs. Gilbreth, 76, was born in Oakland, Calif. She married Frank B. Gilbreth, a pioner industrial efficiency engineer, in 1904. After her husband died in 1924, Mrs. Gilbreth turned her attention to science and engineering in order to take up her husband's work where he left off.

She earned a master's degree in engineering at the University of Michigan in 1928 and a doctorate in engineering at Rutgers in 1929. From 1935 to 1948, Mrs. Gilbreth was director of courses in motion study and utilization of technological progress and professor of management at Purdue university.

During World War II, Mrs. Gilbreth was a member of advisory committees to the office of war information and the war manpower commission.

Mrs. Gilbreth is the author of many articles in the field of education, management, psychology and time-motion study. She has received many awards, among them two in 1954 never before won by a woman—the Washington award conferred by 5 major United States enginering societies and the gold medal of the International Committee of Scientific Management.

Tribute to Robert A. Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I delivered at the Taft memorial dinner, before the Suffolk County Republican Club, in Boston, Mass., on last Friday, May 6, 1955.

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

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, I am pleased once again to be in the city of Boston and the State of Massachusetts.

For many years I have known your distinguished Governor, Chris Herter, who has

made such an outstanding record as your Chief Executive. This is also the home State of my good friend and colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, who serves as Senate Republican whip.

I am also happy to be here tonight with Lloyd Taft, the son of the man whose memory we are to honor.

Robert A. Taft was generally known as "Mr. Republican." In a larger sense, however, he was "Mr. American" as well. His death was not only a great loss to his family, his friends, and his colleagues in the Senate, but to the Nation as well.

In the course of events someone had to be selected to succeed to his position as Republican leader of the Senate. However, in the broader sense, no one could ever replace Bob Taft, the great leader that he was.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee while he was Republican leader of the Senate. As a result, my association with him was a pleasant and cordial one and we worked very closely together in developing the legislative proposals of the first Republican administration in 20 years.

From the earliest meetings at the White House with the Republican leaders of the House and Senate, President Eisenhower had made it clear that he recognized, under the Constitution, that Congress was and is a coequal branch of the Federal Government. He requested a full and frank discussion of the various problems brought up for consideration at these gatherings.

During the 20 years of the New Deal a misconception had developed in some quarters as to the place of Congress in our constitutional system.

We will not find President Eisenhower seeking to seize American industry, large or small, without authority of law and under the vague doctrine of inherent powers in the Presidency.

On the doctrine that Congress was not intended to be and should not be a rubber-stamp or a subordinate body to the Executive, Bob Taft and President Eisenhower were in full agreement. Needless to say, I completely concur in this viewpoint.

The first section of article I of our Constitution states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

As can be readily seen, this is not a partial grant of legislative power, it is total in character. The Congress is where "all" legislative power was intended to be and where it will continue to remain if our constitutional Government is to survive. The American public has an intuitive understanding of what is at stake. They understand the importance of maintaining the coequal and coordinate status of the three great branches of our Government.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted to subordinate the Supreme Court by his Court-packing legislation public opinion rose to support the opposition to that legislation in the Congress.

When the same President attempted to purge members of his own party who were exercising their independent judgment and following their convictions, that purge attempt badly failed. The Nation does not want nor in the end will it tolerate either the Supreme Court or the Congress abdicating their responsibilities or becoming subordinate to the will of the Executive.

Fortunately for the Nation we have in President Eisenhower a man who recognizes this fact and the constitutional limitations of Presidential power under the American Constitution.

The Republican convention recognizing the sound principle that we should be the government of laws and not of men and having great faith in our Constitution wanted to make certain that there would be no short-cut method of depriving Americans of their constitutional rights. In this regard the 1952 platform states: "We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution."

From time to time, however, it has to be pointed out to some of the columnists and to the New Deal opposition that the party leader in the Senate has a dual responsibility. It is not only to help interpret the views of the administration to his colleagues, but it is also to help convey the views of the Members of the Senate to the executive department.

He is not and, in my judgment, should not be like a Cabinet officer who can be dismissed at will or a military officer who can be disciplined. For the Senate leader of either party to be placed in that position would, in fact, help to establish the doctrine that the Congress was a subordinate rather than a coequal branch of Government. The party leaders in the Senate and the House, along with the President, also have the responsibility of carrying out the pledges of the party platform during the period between the meetings of the national nominating conventions.

In the past, Republicans have been properly critical of Democratic platforms that have not been carried out during the term for which their candidates received their mandate from the people. We must be alert to the fact that if we ourselves do not have a good batting average in this regard our derelictions would be pointed out by the opposition.

Personally, I believe that the party platform adopted in 1952 in Chicago is as sound today as it was on July 10, 1952, when it was adopted.

A section of the platform reads as follows: "Our goal is a balanced budget, a reduced national debt, an economical administration, and a cut in taxes. We believe in combating inflation by encouraging full production of goods and food, and not through a program of restrictions."

Part of this platform pledge has been met and we have less than 2 years left to comply with the balance.

The Republican Party as a basic matter of principle has stood for a balanced economy, a solvent Government, and a sound dollar.

I believe that before the next Republican National Convention meets in San Francisco in 1956, the Republican Party will have carried out a substantial majority of its pledges. Such an accomplishment will require a continuous devotion to this objective by all Republicans in the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

For we have been faced with the unusual situation that after 20 years under the New Deal, the Republicans were given a mandate and control of the executive branch, and a narrow control of the legislative branch, of the Government for a period of the first 2 years. This year the opposition party gained control of the House and Senate.

I want to remind this audience and the country of several key paragraphs in that party platform:

"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."

The publication of the Yalta papers was a necessary step in giving to the Congress and to the Nation the full facts relative to the Yalta Conference. It is equally important that there be a prompt publication of the papers of the Teheran, Cairo, and Potsdam Conferences.

It was not until the publication of the Yalta papers that the Congress and the country had the information that the then Secretary of State Stettinius in January of 1945 ordered that all the papers being prepared for consideration of the President at the February Yalta Conference of the Big Three should be forwarded to the President through Alger Hiss.

This placed Hiss in a position to know in advance the various recommendations on policy being recommended to the President by the various executive agencies.

In view of the fact that it was some years earlier on September 2, 1939, information was first taken to the executive branch of the Government relative to the Hiss activities with espionage groups it places a heavy responsibility upon the then administration for permitting him to hold such a key position on the eve of the Yalta Conference and to attend the sessions.

On page 91 of the recently released Yalta papers it states:

"At the Secretary's staff committee meeting of January 10, the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

It was also quite clear that the party platform pledged the administration to enter into no deal or understanding with the Soviet Union that would destroy the hope of the enslaved people of the world, be they in Europe or Asia, that some day they might be free. In this regard the platform reads:

"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."

* * * * *

"The policies we espouse will revive the contageous, liberating influences which are inherent in freedom. They will inevitably set up strains and stresses within the captive world which will make the rulers impotent to continue in their monstrous ways and mark the beginning of their end."

In the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Our policy is and should be, "peace with honor," not peace at any price.

The world should have learned at Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of freemen largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact and mutual defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last 2 treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals, and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of

Representatives passed the Formosa Resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our Allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

In violation of the terms of the Korean armistice, the Chinese Communists still hold 15 American prisoners of war. Eleven of them have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years.

I believe that the position taken by the State Department on Saturday, April 23, was sound when they stated our policy would be to have the Communists show their good faith by the forthwith release of the American prisoners they now hold.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory in Asia and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communist of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Germany, because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to the take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks, we broke the 1948 blockade of Berlin by the air lift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of the island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad which have indicated that we must placate communism when they get aggravated for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is no.

At Munich, Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have "no further territorial demands in Europe".

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience, Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression. But the guaranty given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight, largely because they had lost their faith in the Western Allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory and they are not today.

That these outposts have a military value, no man can deny, for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of Amoy and Foochow as long as the Free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to Free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan and elsewhere where people understand the brutal and aggressive nature of communism.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as steppingstones toward Formosa and the Pescadores.

When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts? If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and their reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reenforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross your heart and hope to die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-faced violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

I want to share with this audience tonight a letter I recently received from an American pilot now stationed on the island of Formosa. He wrote me as follows:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years I'm sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any Americans. The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I'm quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcefully represent.

"I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Calumet-Sag I: An Authoritative Statement by Congressman Thomas J. O'Brien in Behalf of All Members From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the statement on May 6, 1955, of the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, speaking by bipartisan designation and for the entire delegation from Illinois, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ILLINOIS, SIXTH DISTRICT, CHICAGO, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PANEL NO. 1

At this time I find it most encouraging, gratifying, and hopeful to realize that the Calumet-Sag Channel project has finally reached this stage of discussion. Actually, this approach to constructive action has been long overdue. For in this project we have one that is of paramount importance, not only to the citizens of Illinois, but to the whole vast and vital midcontinent area of the United States.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the subject of Cal-Sag did not reach this stage of discussion years earlier. For Cal-Sag has been the No. 1 bottleneck in our system of inland waterways for more than 30 years. The responsibility for the neglect of Cal-Sag must rest with those agencies and organizations which failed to impress upon Congress and the public the vital nature of the Cal-Sag project.

For my own part, I must admit that I knew little about this project even though it lies in the Chicago area in which I reside. Probably I would have continued in my lack of knowledge had it not been for the magnificent educational and publicity program staged by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee and through the personal contacts and discussions which grew out of the information broadcast in this campaign.

For too many years the Cal-Sag project was admittedly ignored and rejected. Then, about 2 years ago, the long-overdue campaign on behalf of the project was staged. The campaign was a magnificent one, bringing home to all of us the importance of Cal-Sag and the manner in which it was holding back an estimated $3 billion industrial expansion and an estimated 500,000 new job opportunities in the area while at the same time it strangled the whole of our development of our inland-waterways system.

CREDIT DUE KILLIAN AND ALLISON

Too much credit cannot be given to those individuals responsible for this campaign. By this I mean specifically Mr. John L. Killian, legislative vice president of the committee, as well as Anthony G. Allison, its executive vice president.

The campaign organized and carried through dynamically under the leadership of these men put Cal-Sag squarely into the limelight for Congress and the public. Through the educational program of this committee, my fellow Congressmen from Illinois and I were made aware of the true facts concerning Cal-Sag and the necessity for vigorous action on its behalf.

It is for this reason that I have decided to limit my remarks to a general outline of the project and potentialities and to leave the more detailed presentation of the project to the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee whose spokesman will follow me as a witness before this committee.

It was an awareness of the critical importance of the Cal-Sag Channel project, as brought to me by the Cal-Sag committee, that last year motivated me and my colleagues of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives to sign a resolution petitioning the President and the Director of the Budget to place this worthy and necessary project in the budget. Now that this has been done and the project is being given proper consideration I feel that it is highly important that all concerned should be made aware of the economic importance of this long neglected though vital key in our otherwise magnificent system of inland waterways.

HOLDS A VITAL KEY POSITION

To anyone not conversant with the critical importance of the Cal-Sag Channel I suggest a study of the location of this waterway on a map of the midcontinent area. A glance is sufficient to force appreciation of its vital key position. It lies, as a mere glance shows, squarely at the crossroads on one of the world's greatest inland waterways system. To the north lies the Great Lakes where a huge fleet of ore carriers move the mountains of iron ore which feed our basic industry—steel. Because of this, we have had the tremendous development and expansion of the steel industry, particularly in the Chicago area, which has during the past few years, risen to the position of the leading steel producer of the Nation.

To the south lies the inland waterway system formed by the Mississippi and its tributaries. This system veins the whole vast and productively rich midcontinent area that now contains over half the wealth and population of the United States.

Squarely between these two independent systems lies the Cal-Sag Channel. Let me stress this interdependence of these two waterway systems. For, as the fleet of Great Lakes carriers feeds industry with iron ore and other raw materials, so the Mississippi system of inland waterways carries an equally critical burden of other raw materials to industries such as petroleum, chemicals, grain and others.

Of this great national system of primary production located in the heartland of America, Chicago is the economic capital city and nerve center. By the same token, the Cal-Sag Channel is the connecting link that allows Chicago to function in its role of economic capital and ties the two waterway systems into one unified and efficient whole.

INDUSTRIAL CENTER OF NATION

This has been the position of the Cal-Sag Channel throughout the years that the Mid-Continent area developed into the No. 1 industrial area of the Nation. However, during all that time the Cal-Sag Channel was practically ignored, its critical position disregarded, its tremendous potentials never developed or realized in terms of material economy and industrial efficiency.

That the Cal-Sag Channel exists, even in its present inadequate form, is a tribute to the energy and foresight of the people of Illinois. A Cal-Sag Channel was an absolute necessity since Chicago began to develop as a great commercial and industrial center. Because of this local agencies constructed the present channel and have paid for its operation and maintenance for over 50 years of its existence.

The replacement cost of work done by the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago on this link of our inland waterway system would be over $350 million.

Realizing the key importance of Cal-Sag, Congress acted in 1930 to make Cal-Sag a Federal waterway. Because of its key position and its obvious indaquacy, Congress acted again in 1946 to declare Cal-Sag a Federal public works project. But at that time no further action was taken. No funds were allocated. So Cal-Sag remained a neglected, though still a critically important, job to be tackled.

DEVELOPING A MODERN WATERWAY

During this time the economic importance of our inland waterway system drew attention and attendant action. A great system of modern transportation developed along the Mississippi and its tributaries. New locks and dams were constructed. The Illinois River, to cite an instance, was developed as a modern waterway.

However, while this constructive action on our inland waterway added greatly to our industrial efficiency and aided in the growth of prosperity in the midcontinent area, it actually threw a greater and greater burden upon the obsolete and inadequate Cal-Sag Channel. For, as these waterways leading north were improved, a constantly growing volume of waterborne traffic pressed upon the Cal-Sag Channel which, year by year, became a more serious bottleneck and an impediment to the movement of freight and the expansion of industry.

Thus, the position of Cal-Sag became more and more impossible. Now, this position has been made even more intolerable. For, just as the development of the waterways to the south have credited a stalemate at Cal-Sag, so, now, plans for further development to the north make action on Cal-Sag absolutely imperative. I refer to the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. As everyone knows, this project will open the Great Lakes, not only to Atlantic shipping, but to the newly discovered and developed rich ore bodies of Labrador. As this invaluable flow of ore reaches the ports of the Great Lakes, no city will feel greater effects than Chicago. And, if the beneficial effects of this new ore body is to be felt in increased prosperity throughout the midcontinent area, the avenue through which the benefits must flow will be the Cal-Sag Channel.

IMMEDIATE ACTION IMPERATIVE

It becomes obvious, therefore, that immediate action must be taken to break the bottleneck of Cal-Sag and allow general prosperity and industrial expansion to flow through the one channel that Nature has designated as the only available avenue.

In all discussion of Cal-Sag we should note that Chicago is now in process of an ambitious program of port development. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, it is believed Chicago will become the greatest inland port in the world. But, again, Cal-Sag is a key piece in all plans. For, Chicago cannot realize its port potentials, nor can it serve the huge and rich area of which it is the economic capital unless Cal-Sag is modernized. Such modernization would make Cal-Sag what it should be, the efficient key channel linking Atlantic sealanes and the ores of Labrador to the Mississippi Valley, the Gulf of Mexico, and the seas beyond.

In the Chicago area alone, it is conservatively estimated, completion of Cal-Sag would spark an industrial development involving billions of dollars in new and expanded industries, thus creating many thousands of new jobs while at the same time it would stabilize and make more secure those industries already operating in the area and maintain the established high level of prosperity enjoyed by all workers in this area.

WOULD BENEFIT ENTIRE NATION

In appealing to this committee for the most sober and thoughtful consideration of this project, I would point out that no single project in years has such wide possibilities of benefit to so many people. For there can be no calculating the wide, even all-embracing character of this project. It is physically located in Illinois, but the benefits deriving from its completion would be felt from the Appalachian Range to the Rockies, and from the northern ports of Duluth and Superior to New Orleans and the whole gulf coast.

Therefore I urge this committee to approve the appropriations on the budget for the Cal-Sag project so that construction can get underway immediately.

In conclusion, I should like to express my deep appreciation to this committee for the opportunity afforded me to present my views on this vital project.

Calumet-Sag II: Background History of Vitally Necessary Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following statement on the history of the Calumet-Sag project submitted by Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN at the conclusion of and supplementing his argument on May 6, 1955, before panel No. 1 of the Committee on Appropriations:

BACKGROUND HISTORY OF CALUMET-SAG

Construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel was begun in 1911 and the channel was completed in 1922. This period of construction was much longer than it should have been, due to the delay occasioned by World War I.

The use of the Calumet-Sag Channel for navigational purposes came about through necessity, because this channel bisects the ridge of land that lies as the major barrier between navigation on the Great Lakes and the great inland waterway system that leads to the Gulf of Mexico. A channel through this ridge of land has been a prime necessity ever since Chicago began its rise as a great national industrial and transportation center. While the Calumet-Sag Channel never proved adequate for navigational purposes, the demands of the waterways forced its use as a barge canal.

Recognition of this fact by the Federal Government was evidenced in 1930, when the Calumet-Sag Channel was made a Federal waterway by act of Congress. At this time, the inadequacy of the Calumet-Sag Channel was also recognized locally, and modernization of the channel was requested by various groups at sundry times.

APPROVED BY ARMY ENGINEERS

Such demands resulted in further action by the Federal Government in 1946, when the projected work on Calumet-Sag was approved by the United States Army engineers and was auhorized as a Federal works project by act of Congress.

However, nothing was ever successfully done about Federal appropriations for the construction of the Calumet-Sag, even though barge traffic on this waterway rose from a few thousand tons carried in 1930 to an estimated 4 million tons which will be

carried on the canal this year. Naturally, public demands for modernization of the Calumet-Sag Channel have grown in exact proportion to the rising burden of freight borne by the waterway.

The United States Army engineers, as a result of studies carried on for years on the Calumet-Sag and the area it serves, have conservatively estimated that the potential tonnage to be carried on a modernized Calumet-Sag should amount to some 18 million tons annually.

UNITED SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION

It is against this background that the following resolution is presented:

"Whereas because of its critical position as a link between the waterborne traffic of the Great Lakes and the vast inland waterway system leading to the Gulf of Mexico, the Calumet-Sag Channel, with its present inadequate width and its obsolete locks and installations, seriously hampers the normal flow of trade and commerce on a national scale; and

"Whereas the Calumet-Sag Channel is vital to all industry and commerce in the entire midcontinent area from the headwaters of the Mississippi waterway system at Duluth-Superior and St. Paul-Minneapolis, and in the area served by the Ohio and Monogahela Rivers to the Gulf ports of New Orleans, Pensacola, and Mobile, as well as to Houston and other ports on the intercoastal canal; and

"Whereas this channel is absolutely essential to the needs of national defense, as was so clearly proven during World War II; and with the growing threat of atomic warfare, the Calumet-Sag Channel becomes of even greater importance to the future of our national defense; and

"Whereas there has developed a critical and intolerable traffic congestion at the foot of Lake Michigan, in which this channel is the key factor in a situation affecting railroads, highways, and other forms of transportation, and which cannot be corrected without the modernization of Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas all planning for Chicago port development, road and bridge building, and other such attempts to break this traffic congestion hampering the movement of trade and commerce in the area, is dependent upon the decision to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas practically all costs connected with the channel up to the present time—an estimated total of over $400 million at current values—has been borne by local authorities and agencies; and

"Whereas all of these agencies have indicated agreement to make all necessary concessions, turn over needed property, and to cooperate in every practicable manner with the Federal Government, thus reducing the probable cost of construction to a fraction of what it would be without this very substantial local participation; and

"Whereas the United States Army engineers have reported that the Calumet-Sag Channel project offers a ratio of benefits to be derived against costs incurred of about 3 to 1 (2.55 to 1), and this is reported to be the most economical with the highest ratio, of any major large-scale Federal works project in the country; and

"Whereas this project can be carried through to completion without any stoppage of navigation or the flow of traffic on any other form of transportation, and, at the same time, will not hamper the operations of any industry already producing in the area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the undersigned, do hereby unanimously petition the Bureau of the Budget to include an adequate amount of funds to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel in its budget for the fiscal year of 1956; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Calumet-Sag Channel, as authorized by act of Congress in 1946 as a Federal works project, be specifically eliminated from any ceiling criteria.

"John C. Kluczynski, Thomas J. O'Brien, Thomas S. Gordon, William L. Dawson, Melvin Price, Sidney B. Yates, Peter Mack, Jr., Barratt O'Hara, James B. Bowler, Harold H. Velde, Chauncey W. Reed, N. M. Mason, Leo E. Allen, Charles W. Vursell, Marguerite Stitt Church, Sid Simpson, R. B. Chiperfield, Edgar A. Jonas, Richard W. Hoffman, Fred E. Busbey, William E. McVey, Timothy P. Meehan, William L. Springer, L. C. Arends, C. W. Bishop.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 7, 1954*."

Mining Claims on the Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there have recently been introduced in the House a number of bills that correct abuses of the mining laws on public lands. A proposal which has the strong support of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, the mining industry, and a number of conservationist groups has been introduced by four Members of the House, including myself.

This measure would—

First. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act. This provision is similar to the Regan bill in the 82d and 83rd Congresses, which had the endorsement of the Forest Service.

Second. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent—

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources—except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws—and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

Third. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a quiet-title action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area. This procedure calls for adequate notice to mining claimants in the area involved, and a local hearing to determine any rights to surface resources that may be asserted by claim holders. If a mining claimant fails to assert rights to surface resources, or if the rights he asserts are not upheld, or if he voluntarily waives such rights, the claim would thereafter have the same status as claims hereafter located, with the Government having the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage and to manage other surface resources in accordance with sound principles of good management.

In the May issue of the Mining Congress Journal, there appears the following editorial pertaining to this measure which I would like to call to the attention of the House:

NOW WE'RE GETTING SOMEWHERE

(By John C. Fox, editor)

Recent introduction in the House and Senate of measures designed to curb abuses of the mining laws without disturbing their basic principles has the support of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and many users of the public domain.

For many years a continuous barrage of adverse publicity has been leveled at abuses of existing mining laws. The general mining laws have been called archaic and outmoded. Actually, where the mining laws have been abused, the fault has largely lain in lax administration and not in the laws themselves.

Myopic critics have completely overlooked the part our mining laws played and are continuing to play in the devolpment of the West, and in assuring a supply of vital raw materials for our growing civilian economy and the defense needs of our Nation, needs that are likely to continue high for the foreseeable future.

It is a basic principle of our mining laws that every American may enter on the public lands to search out mineral deposits. It is also a basic principle that every American having found evidence of mineralization has the right to locate a mining claim and furthermore, when he has invested time and money in the development of such claim to the point where it justifies the granting of a patent, he is entitled to a full "fee simple" title, with the security of tenure and the sound basis for future financing of mining operations which such a title provides.

Our Nation depends on mining for its supply of metals, minerals, and fuels. Mining, in turn, needs encouragement to explore for and develop mineral deposits. The principles upon which our mining laws were built supply the kind of incentive needed. The industry has never condoned the abuses that have provoked such floods of criticism. Instead it has sought means of curbing those abuses without abandoning the fundamental principles of existing law.

The proposed legislation is the product of intensive work by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and conferences between representatives of those departments and of the mining industry. Its enactment would remove the primary causes of abuse of the mining laws and provide for multiple use of the surface of mining claims hereafter located, prior to patent. It would provide the Federal Government a means of clearing up title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, while protecting the claim-holder's basic rights. It would guarantee to the miner full rights for prospecting, development, and related activities and preserve his right, upon patent, to the same full

title to his claim as under the existing mining law.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would solve a problem that has been before the Congress and the public for two decades. It should have the support of every mining man and every user of the public lands.

Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a situation involving the relations of this country with Japan, which, in light of the aid we are giving that country, seems to me to be a proper subject for consideration by the Congress.

We entered into a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with Japan in 1953. Under article XIV of that treaty, it was specifically provided that no discrimination shall be practiced with reference to any restrictions on exports and imports of goods between the two countries, over and above the restrictions imposed with respect to any other nations.

However, in the face of this treaty and the GATT agreement, which contains similar provisions, and to which Japan has adhered, Japan has embargoed shipments to the United States only of certain merchandise without such an embargo being placed on such shipments to any other country. The Department of State has called this treaty violation to the attention of the Japanese very forcefully, and finally on April 22 presented to the Japanese Foreign Office a formal note setting out the treaty violation and asking that if a further delay in replying is required, the effective date of the embargo be postponed. To date, no reply whatever has been received to this note, and the embargo has gone into effect. As a result, the American interests, who entered into contracts in Japan in good faith and based on the integrity of our treaty obligations, have suffered very substantial losses.

Granted our desire to work with our friends abroad, as indicated by the tremendous military and economic aid program of this country, this cooperative spirit should in no manner interfere with our protection of the legitimate interests of our businessmen abroad. If our current attempts to encourage foreign investment and enterprise by Americans is to succeed, it behooves our Government to stand by our businessmen. The situation I have outlined is a vivid example, and I sincerely hope that our Department of State takes whatever measures it feels necessary to secure fair and legal treatment through compliance by the Japanese with their treaty obligations. Only in this way can we demonstrate the courage and conviction consonant with our position of leadership in world affairs. Without this courage and conviction, the development of American enterprise abroad must suffer heavily.

Problems of a Republican President and Democratic Congress in Working Together—Talk by Congressman William T. Granahan Before Sentry Club, Wednesday, May 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a copy of a talk which I delivered Wednesday night, May 4, to the members of the Sentry Club, an organization of outstanding Philadelphia women. In it I discussed on an objective level the problems which arise with divided responsibilities in Government—that is, divided between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, or vice versa. As I tried to point out in that talk, it is natural in a two-party system, such as we have, for partisan politics to become injected in many policy decisions, but at the same time the strength of our American system lies in the fact that we can and do work together whenever the safety of this country and the basic freedoms of Americans are concerned.

PROBLEMS OF A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT AND DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS IN WORKING TOGETHER

Beginning back in the election campaign last fall, the question of how a Republican President and a Democratic Congress can work together in harmony and in good faith has been worrying a great many people.

To some students of political science, this sort of situation of divided responsibility in Government between two political parties is considered extremely unfortunate. It seldom happens in other democracies for the reason that the executive head of the government is usually the leader of the majority party in the parliament. To some people, then, the fact that it can happen and does happen periodically in the United States is supposed to be one of the big faults with our constitutional system of elections.

As a matter of fact, we can remember back to 1946 when an able, outstanding Democrat, Senator FULBRIGHT, seriously suggested that President Truman appoint a prominent Republican as his Secretary of State and then resign, so that the Republican could then succeed him as President. That was, of course, before the passage of the new succession act which provides that in the absence of a Vice President, the Speaker of the House and then the President pro tempore of the Senate should be in line for the Presidency before any Cabinet member.

When Senator FULBRIGHT made that suggestion, he was fearful that the divided Government created by the election of a Republican Congress during a Democratic President's term of office would bring us chaos. As a one-time Rhodes scholar, Senator FULBRIGHT was very familiar with the English system in which the Prime Minister always represents the majority party.

As it turned out, Senator FULBRIGHT's fears in 1946 were overly pessimistic. And so were President Eisenhower's last fall when he predicted in Republican campaign speeches that if the Democrats won Congress the country would have two drivers and go in the ditch. It is significant this time, I think, that no one has suggested that both Eisenhower and NIXON resign so that Speaker RAYBURN could be President. And Mr. Eisenhower himself has acknowledged that his talk about the country going into the ditch was mostly campaign exaggeration.

So it looks as if we can get through the next 2 years with a Republican President and a Democratic Congress without any breakdown of the American political system. We learned in 1947–48 during the 80th Congress that most Members of Congress are patriotic enough to suppress bitter partisan obstructionism in time of national danger.

On the other hand, there are problems—a great many problems—in this kind of situation. It would be silly to shut our eyes to them or to pretend that they don't exist. The best policy is to face up to these problems and do what we can to iron them out.

In talking to you this evening, I want to try to bring into focus the two sides of this troublesome problem of divided political responsibility in government—the President's problems in dealing with a Democratic Congress, and the problems of the majority party in Congress itself. For there are problems on both sides.

But in no case are they insurmountable, if there is good will and good faith on both sides. And I hope we can achieve that.

But let me point out one very important fact before we go into this any deeper. It is this:

Under no circumstances should we expect to see President Eisenhower stop being a Republican or those of us in the majority party in Congress stop being Democrats just because we've got to work together. We choose up our political sides on the basis of certain principles of government in which we believe. It would be a sad thing indeed for American democracy—based on a two-party system—if those political beliefs were just superficial—if we had to throw them overboard as the only means of achieving harmony and progress in a period such as this.

I want to emphasize that point, for I think it is very important. The Democrats in Congress do not have to run out on everything they believe in just in order to cooperate with Eisenhower. And the President does not have to turn into a Democrat in order to cooperate with us. So please, in the coming 2 years, don't be either surprised or disappointed that these changes in basic principles and views have not occurred.

If the President holds stubbornly to some position and the Congress holds stubbornly to another—and this may happen from time to time—then the question is not whether the Democrats should give in because the President is Republican, or whether the President should give in because the Congress is Democratic. The only question will be. Which side is right? Or, if that can't honestly be determined in the circumstances, then the question is: How do we find a middle ground?

For when you come down to it, nearly all legislation passed by Congress and signed into law by the President is a compromise This is fundamental in American government.

You may be surprised to hear, in fact, that most of the bills which pass Congress and become law are passed by unanimous consent. That doesn't mean everybody agrees wholeheartedly about everything in each of those bills. What it does mean is that in order to get those bills through, so many compromises have to be made between strong views on both sides that finally a middle ground is reached and the less-than-perfect compromise is accepted.

This happens whether the Congress is Republican or Democratic; it happens, too, whether the Congress and the President belong to the same party or to different parties. That's because within the two parties there

are strong differences of opinion on many issues; and also because party lines often cut across geographical or sectional or economic issues. Therefore, eastern Republicans and Democrats are often joined on one side against western or southwestern Democrats and Republicans, on the other.

So there is much precedent for a Republican President and a Democratic Congress finding a common ground for a middle course on many of the big issues to come up in these next 2 years.

But behind this cooperation and harmony, there will always be partisan political considerations, too—so don't be surprised when you see them crop up.

Now let's look at some of the problems involved in this cooperative effort to provide effective Government leadership with divided political responsibility in Washington. First of all, let's look at it from the President's viewpoint; President Eisenhower—and this would be true of any President in the same situation—wants to make his administration succeed. He certainly would not want to climax a distinguished military career with a failure in the greatest and most responsible job in the world, as President of the United States.

Every President develops a sense of history—and of his place in it. But, while looking at the long-range evaluation of his place in the history books, he must also be acutely conscious of his place in current history—in the newspapers and magazines and in the minds and hearts of the people. He knows he can accomplish more, both within his own administration and in dealing with Congress, if he is popular with the public generally. But sometimes he has to run the risk that some policies which he feels are very important to the Nation might be unpopular with the people.

If the program is very unpopular, he has a tough time, indeed, getting Congress to accept it, for, after all, every Member of the House of Representatives has to run for reelection every 2 years or else quit and get out. If he gets out voluntarily or is defeated, he loses his seniority automatically; therefore, if he comes back to Congress later, he comes back as a freshman all over again and has to start again from the bottom of the ladder. So in the House, and to a certain extent in the Senate, too, even though they have 6-year terms over there, an unpopular program has tough sledding; many Members feel they vote their own political suicide if they approve an unpopular measure.

But they will do it—and they have done it often—if the President convinces them of his sincerity, of his good faith, and of the underlying vital nature for the whole country of the policy he has recommended.

Now, when the President and the congressional majority are of the same party, the President can get further on this kind of approach. The Congress knows the President would not deliberately cut the ground out from his own party members in the House and Senate.

But when a Republican President tries to sell a Democratic Congress on an unpopular course of action—or the other way around in the case of Truman and the 80th Congress—many Members might feel the President isn't really a bit interested in whether they are reelected or defeated; some might even suspect the proposal of being deliberately calculated to hurt the opposition in the forthcoming election.

Does this sound overly suspicious? Perhaps so. I am only reporting on how Members sometimes feel in a situation like this, and many will continue to remember that the President's party leaders in effect called Democrats pro-Communist in 1954 in order to try to defeat them. That rankles deeply as one of the worst things that could be charged to any patriotic American.

So the President is under a handicap in selling Congress on unpopular legislation, even though, as President, he may have to try his best to do so.

Now, suppose he were to go to the extreme length of praising individual Democrats to the skies as great Americans, honoring them and flattering them in various ways to prove his friendship and good faith in seeking their help on a very unpopular course of action. The President's own party would then scream to high heaven, particularly in the States and districts represented by the Democrats he praised so highly. This might cause him a loss of support from his own party in the Congress, since many Republicans of the rgiht wing have never really accepted Eisenhower as a true Republican anyway.

Therefore, he must call his shots as he sees them; he must sometimes break with his own party leaders when they insist on going after the Democrats as a party of treason; his Vice President, whose campaigning was considered below the belt by many Democrats, cannot help him very much in dealing with those same Democrats in leadership positions in the Congress.

So the President has got to work hard and constantly at maintaining the confidence of the opposition party in the Congress, particularly where he and we agree on objectives. This is particularly true in the foreign-policy field; most of the President's difficulties on this have come, in fact, from within his own party, so he must depend largely on Democrats to get these measures through. Therefore, you see him by and large soft-pedaling the political attacks where this issue is concerned.

Yet, right after the reciprocal trade-agreements bill went through the House successfully only because of the magnificent work of Speaker RAYBURN, you had the situation of the President unleashing a terrific attack on the Democrats and even including the Speaker for alleged irresponsibility on the tax-reduction proposal. This was apparently his way of backing up and bucking up the Republicans to get them to unite solidly behind him on that proposal and keep them happy with his leadership.

So that is often how it goes. One day the opposition party is hailed by the President as patriotic, and the next day as irresponsible. He plays down the political battles where the issue is vital to the country's foreign policy but gets his partisanship into it in some other way on domestic issues. It is a difficult role for the President to play, and we often think he overdoes quite a bit in letting some of his friends inject partisanship and animosity against the opposition party in every possible way. Of course, these same administration officials probably think we overdo the attacks—so you see it's a question of which side of the fence you're on coloring your view of this problem.

Now let's look at some of the practical problems on the other side of it—for the Democrats in the Congress. Year in and year out, both parties are always anxious to capture the presidency and the administrative machinery. Patronage is one aspect of that, but certainly not a major one. The real stakes are the decisions on national policy. Again, I repeat, we have pretty deep-seated views about government and we want to see our views prevail for what we sincerely believe are the best interests of the whole country. This is true of both parties. Democrats believe a Democratic administration is better for the country; Republicans believe their party can do more good for the country. I say that is fine; that's the way things should be. We should have strong views on issues and policies.

Thus, when a Democratic Congress supports a Republican President, because we think he is right on a particular issue, we know we may be making him and his party look better politically than they would otherwise. Nevertheless, we have got to do the same thing the President must do in this situation: We've got to bury party considerations time after time in order to serve national interests. Even while doing this, we know that the President in 1956 will be out to beat us, no matter how well we might have cooperated with him on the really vital issues If he weren't out to beat us, then he wouldn't be much of a Republican Party leader, would he?

Another thing; we may be buttered up by the administration from time to time to get us to vote for something the President wants, but then, as the opposition party, we see these policies administered, frequently, by officials who are completely out of sympathy with us. The Republican administration is composed largely of active Republican partisans—many of them much more partisan than the President. And they use the machinery of Government to try to beat Democrats and elect Republicans,. This is not a complaint; it is a fact. The Republicans said the same thing about the Truman administration during the 80th Congress.

On the other hand, the Democrats had been in power so long during the Roosevelt and Truman years that the newness of power had worn off and frequently the goal was to get a particular job done regardless of whether Democrats or Republicans did it and got the credit. Many Republicans had very high positions in the Democratic administrations—some even as Cabinet officers. So far as I know, however, there is only one really high Democrat in this whole administration, Ambassador Bruce who is almost irreplaceable.

So we feel left out of the day-to-day decisions on policy. We get no credit for supporting the administration when we do; we get all kinds of criticism for opposing it.

All this means is that under our 2-party system, there are problems on both sides; there are frustrations and headaches for both the President and the Congress when they belong to opposing parties.

But these are not the really serious, insurmountable problems of government. We can work things out in an atmosphere of good faith—for the simple reason that we have to, for the good of this country. Both sides will play politics when it is safe to do so—safe for the country, that is. They will both have their eyes constantly on 1956. But not to the extent of blinding themselves to the needs of 1955 or of the future, either, in those instances in which American safety, American prosperity, and American decency and justice are at stake.

John William Flannagan, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal sadness that I read the obituaries of John William Flannagan, Jr. The press accounts of his passing took note of his distinguished record in the Congress and of the esteem in which he was held in Virginia. My recollections of our former colleague were occupied more with the human qualities not readily translated into print.

It was my high privilege to know Mr. Flannagan during my first years in this House. I learned early in my experience here that he was a man whose counsel

was much sought by his colleagues and whose judgment commanded great respect and influence. On nine occasions this merited confidence also was manifested by his fellow citizens in Virginia, who elected him to Congress. He served faithfully and with distinction from 1931 until 1949. When he decided to return to private life this House lost one of its most earnest and astute Members.

On countless occasions Mr. Flannagan gave me the benefit of his experience and sound reasoning. When he left these Halls I was deprived of a friendly hand along the way. These few words are poor acknowledgment of the manifold kindnesses he extended. My sincere sympathy, Mr. Speaker, goes out to his family in this bereavement.

Nero Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this means of nominating the Veterans' Administration for the Nero Award.

If the Nero Award is not yet as famous as the Oscar Award, it is only because the Nero Award is a new invention.

Let me explain how it came to be.

This famous Roman Emperor, as we all know, is remembered for his fiddling while Rome burned. The Veterans' Administration, which I am hereby nominating to be its first recipient, has nonmusically equalled his efforts while a housing project in my State sinks into the ground.

Late in 1952 construction was started on Sun Gold Manor, consisting of 100 houses located in Panaca, Nev. Twenty-five of these houses were sold to veterans under the loan-guaranty program, and seven were sold under loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The subdivision was promoted and built for the employees of the Combined Metal Reduction Co., of Caselton, Nev., which operated a lead and zinc mine nearby.

Construction of the homes was completed in 1953. Before the end of the year the occupants of the homes were somewhat intrigued to find that their floors were sinking away from their walls, ceilings were cracking, driveways disappearing, and the very attractive project turning into rapid chaos.

The builder was called back to make repairs. The occupants were even more intrigued to find that the repairs sank, too.

When they became sufficiently intrigued, they naturally contacted their Congressman.

In September of 1954 I contacted the Veteran's Administration in behalf of the residents of Sun Gold Manor. My questions were simple, I thought. I only wanted to know why the homes were sinking and what the Veterans' Administration was going to do about it.

Sixteen days after writing I was advised that the Veterans' Administration "fully realizes the seriousness of such a situation and you may be assured that every effort, within the authority of the Veterans' Administration, will be exerted to alleviate the condition."

In the 8 months that have elapsed since that date, the condition of the Panaca sinking homes has been anything but alleviated.

Since the first of the year, I have been in almost weekly contact with the Veterans' Administration officials handling the case in an attempt to expedite some action.

Last week I finally received some definite word. This definite word is that no further report of no progress can be expected until the week of May 16.

When I am out in the field and ask for answers, they refer me to Washington. Back here they say they will have to check out in the field.

The problem has been back and forth between the Washington office and the regional office of the VA with the same regularity of a shuttlecock in a badminton game.

In badminton, however, somebody wins. The tenants of Panaca's sinking homes continue to lose.

There have been enough official investigations conducted to do credit to the FBI.

The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration have just about decided what makes the houses sink. It is believed this is because the ground on which they are built also sinks.

Apparently, the ground is light alluvial and blow sand that compresses when water is applied from landscaping or sewage disposal.

The Federal Housing Administration seemed to have the interests of the tenants well in mind.

The builder had offered to refund $1,000 to each of the 7 purchasers of FHA-insured homes. This would have left these families in a fairly good position. Their monthly payments would have been regarded as rent and there would have been no deficiency judgment against them.

However, because of delays and an apparent effort to collect $1,000 from the builder for the 25 VA-insured homes—money that would have gone to the agency and not to the individual veteran—the Veterans' Administration caused the builder to withdraw the offer.

Now the FHA purchasers are back where they started from—without the $1,000 and minus the 6 weeks' time it took the Veterans' Administration to cause them this new problem.

Six weeks to produce a new obstacle is about par for the bureaucratic course.

I might also point out that the 32 families who have purchased these homes have not been able to sell them. As we know, the lead and zinc mining industry has been tragically depressed since the end of the Korean war.

These 32 families now find themselves with no jobs in their communities, homes that are sinking away, and a Government agency that has set a new record in bureaucratic delay and buck-passing.

To date the VA has caused the FHA-insured tenants to lose their chance for recovery from this disaster, and has demonstrated no apparent concern for the veterans involved.

I am more than happy to nominate the Veterans' Administration for the Nero award. I can think of no one more deserving.

Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker: Virginia's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 1, 1955, the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF, Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, delivered a very interesting address at the Bethlehem Methodist Church at Moneta, Va., incident to the presentation of an award to Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker as Virginia's Mother of the Year. Mrs. Rucker is highly deserving of the honor bestowed upon her and Mr. POFF's tribute is altogether appropriate.

At this time all of us are mindful of our obligation and devotion to motherhood and I extend hearty congratulations to Mrs. Rucker, who typifies all that is fine and noble among the mothers of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Mr. POFF's address, which is as follows:

I am humbly grateful for the honor you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to pay tribute to one of your fellow citizens who has so nobly distinguished herself.

One rainy day a mother sat in her rocking chair mending clothes. Her noisy little boy, unable to go outside to play, was about to drive her to distraction. In desperation and in an effort to keep him quiet, she tore from a magazine a leaf on which was printed a map of the world. With her scissors, she cut it into a jigsaw puzzle. She scrambled the pieces together, handed them to her son and told him to fit them back together again. Thinking that would keep him occupied the rest of the afternoon, she went back to her mending. However, in less than 10 minutes the boy was back at his mother's elbow with the map of the world intact. His mother could scarcely believe her eyes, and she asked him how he had completed the task so quickly. Sheepishly, he looked up at his mother and explained, "On the back of the map was the picture of a man, and when I put the man together right, the world just took care of itself."

This is the story of the life of Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker. For half a century she has been helping to take care of the world by fitting together the pieces of the lives and characters of men and women. It has been well said that a "mother in her office holds the key of the soul and stamps out the coin of character."

To her providential care and guidance God saw fit to entrust the keys of 13 souls, and the coins of character which she has stamped

have circulated throughout the realm of human experience. Few parents have been so abundantly blessed as have Dr. and Mrs. S. L. Rucker. Still fewer can point with so much justifiable pride to the achievements of their children. How many parents can count among their offspring 2 physicians, 2 dentists, 1 pharmacist, 1 chemist, and 5 homemakers? And how many children owe so much to their mother—a mother who, after the death of a beloved husband and father 24 years ago, took upon herself the burden of feeding, clothing, sheltering, and educating such a large family?

As they—mother, children, and grandchildren—are gathered together here in their hometown, here within the hallowed walls of their home church on this wonderful Lord's Day, what glorious thoughts must crowd their minds and warm their hearts. Ringing and echoing down the long corridor of the years that have passed come the memories of hours of pain and pleasure; hours of woe and joy, gladness and sadness, tears and laughters, play and toil, failure and success. How humble and yet how very proud they must be.

And how very grateful must be the hearts of these fine children for a mother who has labored so long, so faithfully, so untiringly, and so unselfishly in God's great vineyard. How often has she, who 13 times entered the valley of the shadow of death to win a life at the peril of her own, laid down bit by bit and day by day a small segment of her life for her children? How often has she abandoned sleep to sing lullabies? How many times has she bandaged a wound or kissed a bruise; how many clothes has she mended; how many floors has she swept; how many meals has she prepared; how many dishes has she washed; how many stories has she read; how many lessons has she taught; how many times has she smoothed a rough path and brushed away a tear to make room for a smile?

Yes, Miss Bessie's hands have held the key to men's souls and I know through their minds today must be coursing the words of the poet who said:

"My mother's beautiful hands!
They're neither white nor small;
And you, I know, would scarcely think
That they were fair at all.
I've looked on hands whose form and hue
A sculptor's dream might be;
Yet are those wrinkled, aged hands
Most beautiful of all to me.

"Such beautiful, beautiful hands!
Tho heart were weary and sad,
These patient hands kept toiling on,
That the children might be glad;
I always weep when looking back
To childhood's distant day,
I think how those hands rested not,
When mine were busy at play."

But her labors have not been in vain. God has used her richly to bless not only her children but the members of this congregation and the citizens of the community in which she lives. By her Christian example, she has, in the windows of the lives of generations still unborn, lit a candle of faith and hope and inspiration, and in so doing has laid up for herself treasures in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and where thieves do not break through or steal. And long after the Supreme Architect of the Universe, the Father of all mankind has seen fit to call this mother to her eternal reward, the fragrance of her life will linger on in the garden of humanity.

"Her heart is like her garden,
Old-fashioned, quaint and sweet,
With here a wealth of blossoms,
And there a still retreat.
Sweet violets are hiding
We know as we pass by,
And lilies, pure as angel thoughts,
Are opening somewhere nigh.

"Forget-me-nots there linger,
To full perfection brought,
And there bloom purple pansies,
In many a tender thought.
There love's own roses bloom,
As from enchanted ground,
And lavish perfume exquisite,
The whole glad year around.

"And in the quiet garden—
The garden of her heart,
Songbirds are always singing
Their songs of cheer apart.
And from it floats forever,
O'ercoming sin and strife,
Sweet as the breath of roses,
The fragrance of her life."

I think God in His Heaven must be smiling down on us today, and if His Son Jesus were here in the flesh, as He most certainly is in the spirit, I know He would say, "Well done, thy good and faithful servant."

The Russian Menace at Next Year's Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of May 5, 1955, reported that the Soviet Union, in an apparent bid for the 1960 or 1964 Olympics, has announced that it was spending approximately $62 million this year to expand athletic facilities in Moscow. Work has started on the construction of a gigantic stadium, indoor tennis courts, and a summer artificial ice rink. Moscow already has the big Dynamo Stadium and a second smaller stadium.

In a speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst Jr., following his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead fast. From Moscow, he said:

Radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism.

Avery Brundage, in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955, reported that things look bad for us at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, Australia. He said that Russia is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known. Unless there is a sudden awakening in this country, Soviet sportsmen are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia.

They threaten to seize the initiative even in track and field, the feature phase of the games, in which United States athletes have always been supreme—although to a lessening degree—since the games were revived 60 years ago—

Mr. Brundage warned.

Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists.

I have developed a plan, and presented it to this Congress, for meeting the propaganda offensive of the Russians. This plan is developed in several bills—H. R. 5040, H. R. 4307, H. R. 4215, and H. R. 4109—which are specificaly designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst. There is very little money involved, but, if adopted, they would go far toward meeting the major attacks the U. S. S. R. is making upon us in the fields of culture and sports.

Because the very survival of our way of life may depend on taking action now I urge their early consideration and enactment by the Congress.

H. R. 4109 would establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia. The text of my bill is included here. Also included is the text of the New York Times report on the Moscow plans, as well as a recent article by David Sentner, chief of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner. This article also appeared in the Chicago American, the San Francisco American, the Boston American, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, the New York Journal-American, the Milwaukee Sentinel, and the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

H. R. 4109

A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944, is amended by redesignating section 3 as section 4 and by inserting immediately after section 2 the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall advise and consult with the commission in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution. The advisory board shall consist of—

"(1) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of recreation and sports: The United States Olympic Association, the American Recreation Society, the National Recreation Association, the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Amateur Athletic Union, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Athletic Institute, and the Sports Fishing Institute.

"(2) one person selected by each of the following national organizations: The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans, the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, the Marine Corps League, the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation, the American Veterans Commitee, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, and the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States; and

"(3) one person selected by each of the following national service organizations: The

United Service Organizations (USO), the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

"(b) The advisory board may exercise its functions through a working committee composed of 6 members, 2 selected jointly by the organizaitons named in each of the categories enumerated in subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. The first section of such joint resolution is amended (1) by striking out "an athletic field and stadium" and inserting in lieu thereof "an athletic field, stadium, and parade ground," and (2) by striking out "World War I and World War II" and inserting in lieu thereof "World War I, World War II, and the Korean hostilities."

[From the New York Times, of May 5, 1955]

RUSSIANS ARE SPENDING $62 MILLION ON ATHLETIC FACILITIES—ACTION A PRELUDE TO OLYMPICS' BID—RUSSIA REGARDED AS SEEKING 1960 OR 1964 GAMES—MOSCOW SUBURBS GET NEW STADIA

LONDON, May 4.—The Soviet Union, in an apparent bid for the 1960 or 1964 Olympics, announced today it was spending 250 million rubles ($62 million) this year to expand athletic facilities in Moscow.

S. V. Pushnov, chairman of the Moscow City Committee on Physical Culture and Sport, said in a Moscow radio broadcast heard here:

"During this year alone 250 million rubles will be spent on sports facilities.

"Work has started on the construction of a gigantic stadium in Luzhniki (a Moscow suburban district).

"In Sokolniki (another Moscow district) a summer artificial ice rink will be opened on which hockey players, ice skaters and figure skaters can compete. Construction is being completed on new indoor tennis courts."

Pushnov said nothing specifically about trying to obtain the games for the Soviet Union. However, the Russians have been privately talking about it since the Olympic committee meeting in Athens last May.

In talks with foreigners they admitted the only thing preventing their lodging a bid for the games was lack of facilities in Moscow.

STADIUM GROUNDS SMALL

Hungary has been prominently mentioned as a possible 1960 site but the Russians may be aiming at 1964. Next year's games will be held in Australia.

Moscow already has the big Dynamo Stadium, but the grounds around it are small. There's another stadium in the Stalino district, but isn't big enough for the Olympics.

By using the available stadiums—and centering activities in the new one in Luzhniki—the Russians could easily handle the Olympics.

Housing would offer no particular problems to the Russians. If they did not put up an Olympic village, they could do as they've done for other international events—just empty several hotels and use them.

Pushnov also announced this summer would see the inauguration of the first Moscow games. About 300,000 athletes will take part.

SPECIAL POLICE FOR OLYMPICS

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA, May 4.—Melbourne officials announced today that a special police corps had been organized for the 1956 Olympic games "for the protection and general assistance of overseas competitors and visitors."

A committee of senior officers of all branches of the police force will work in close liaison with the organizers of the games. The police station building in the Olympic village of Heidelburg will be staffed by policemen speaking at least two foreign languages.

Special squads of plainclothes policemen will be assigned to safeguard the visitors against pickpockets and confidence men. All incoming ships and airliners will be scrutinized for foreign criminals, descriptions of whom are being obtained from the international police organization.

Meanwhile the Olympic games construction committee, after a stormy 2-hour meeting today, decided to proceed with a 333-meter concrete cycling track at Olympic Park. The track will cost 200,000 Australian pounds ($448,000).

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of April 29, 1955]

HOUSE URGED TO CONSIDER HEARST ART, SPORT PLAN TO COMBAT REDS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, today urged consideration of congressional measures to promote American culture and sports events in line with the program for "competitive coexistence" with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

Concurrently, the House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON's first bill on the subject, providing for the creation of a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts and mass communications center.

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers and Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing its supremacy at the international games.

PROPOSALS

THOMPSON said his legislation is specifically designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain, where he interviewed the four top leaders of Communist Russia.

The measures would create a national advisory committee under the welfare secretary to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby has approved a bill introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Democrat, of New York, for establishment of a Federal Commission on the Arts "and for other purposes."

WARNING

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

THOMPSON called attention of Congress to both the warning of Hearst and Olympic Committee President Brundage on the sports challenge from the Soviet Union.

He referred to a current magazine article by Brundage warning that Russia is building "the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic Games unless "there is a sudden reawakening in this country."

TWENTY YEARS OLD

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex," THOMPSON said.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, which was started more than 20 years ago, was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his recent speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

PRESTIGE

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic Games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-cosncious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

THOMPSON added the legislation introduced by himself, Representatives ROOSEVELT (Democrat, California), and REUSS (Democrat), Wisconsin, was designed to carry out "the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst."

Twentieth Anniversary of the REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the REA program, I deem it appropriate to give the Congress a report on the actions of the program in the First District of Arkansas.

There are 10 counties in the first district, and electric lines extend into each of these counties under member-owned electric cooperatives operation. There are 4 electric cooperative corporations located in the first district, and 2 of them are the largest in the entire State of Arkansas.

The Craighead Electric Cooperative Corp., with headquarters located at Jonesboro, Ark., is the largest in Arkansas, serving 16,500 members on 3,900 miles of line in Craighead, Greene, Poinsett, Lawrence, Crittenden, and parts of Independence and Randolph Counties. This cooperative was first put into operation in November of 1938, and in the years since has served an area principally devoted to agricultural crops of cotton, corn, rice, and soybeans, although the area is growing in the production of beef cattle, dairy animals, hogs, and poultry.

The Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp., with headquarters in Forrest City, Ark., is the second-largest electric cooperative in Arkansas. This cor-

poration has 3,400 miles of line serving 12,500 members. This organization went into operation in 1938, and serves members in St. Francis, Lee, Phillips, Cross, Crittenden, Woodruff, and Monroe Counties.

The Clay County Electric Cooperative Corp., located in Clay, Greene, and Randolph Counties, has its headquarters at Corning, Ark. This cooperative, since going into operation in November of 1939, has expanded to 1,798 miles of lines serving 6,207 members. Agricultural loads served by this cooperative are broiler operations, livestock, dairying, row crop and rice irrigation and cotton gins.

The Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters in Blytheville, Ark., serves one of the richest agricultural areas in the Midsouth. This pioneer cooperative now has 800 miles of lines serving 4,200 members.

It would not be fitting to report on these fine cooperatives without mentioning some of the men who have made these organizations so successful. For these are the men who have worked through the years to bring electricity to the farms.

I would like to recognize the tireless work of such pioneers as Mr. Leon Presson, president of the Clay County Electric Cooperative Corp., and Mr. Adolph Lillard, their able manager. Others in this organization are Mr. J. Frank Ellis, Mr. Thomas Hall, Mr. Paul Moore, Mr. Clois Butler, Mr. C. T. Johnson, Mr. Mack Dalton, Mr. Roy Creek, Mr. W. Z. Porter, and the Honorable E. G. Ward.

In the Craighead organization are such fine men as Mr. S. C. Chapin, the president, and their fine administrative manager, Mr. Earl Walden. Working with these men are Mr. G. C. Jernigan, Mr. Oscar Robinson, Mr. E. L. Stillions, Mr. L. C. Sloan, Mr. C. H. Montieth, Mr. G. M. Shipman, Mr. W. A. Cunningham, Mr. Raybon Sullivan, Mr. Ode Chipman, Mr. Garland Arrington, and the Honorable Charles Frierson.

Associated with Mr. Charley Lutes, president of the Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, and their fine manager, Mr. H. C. Knappenberger, are Mr. Tom Callis, Mr. Charles R. Coleman, Mr. B. B. Threlkeld, Mr. Claude Duncan, Mr. G. W. Garrigan, Mr. J. B. Johnson, Mr. W. E. Hagan, Mr. R. L. Houck, Mr. Lloyd Shelton, and Mr. Earl Wildy.

In the large Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp. and working with their president, Mr. John Doyel, and their fine manager, Mr. T. E. Bostick, are Mr. J. E. Breeding, Mr. V. O. Turner, Mr. James Smith, Mr. E. E. James, Mr. Joseph Whittenton, Mr. J. Crossett, Mr. Carson Brown, Mr. John Brooks, Mr. Homer G. Townes, and their excellent attorney, the Honorable John Eldridge, Jr.

These men, pioneers all in this great work, are continuing to give their service to their neighbors in the work of the REA.

The Meaning of Mother's Day in the Free World and Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have been setting aside special days to emphasize certain human relationships, among them Mother's Day. We have agreed that on the second Sunday in May of each year we will pay tribute to the virtues of motherhood, the love, the courage, and the strength of mothers down the ages, which we recognize as the molding and steadying force in every normal childhood and in every happy home.

There are many things I could say about the custom we are establishing—for to me these days are useful only if they give to every one of the 365 days of our calendar year a deeper sense of what these relationships mean. But today I want to speak for a few minutes about the use being made of Mother's Day and of Children's Day by the Communists who have become so consummately skillful in using the emotions of men and women to hide their purposes.

Women who believe in God—no matter what their form of belief—cannot do less than resent the the use the Communists are making of women in all lands—using words to deceive, to cover up reality. And they exploit these words and send them out to all the corners of the earth.

DANGER SIGNALS

Let me give you some danger signals:

On March 8 of each year, the Communist world celebrates International Women's Day. On this day the International Federation of Democratic Women mobilizes its 66 million women all over the world. On this day Communist women display their power and their contribution to building up the Communist world. All Communist governments, all Communist parties of all countries give special attention to this day, and praise the women for what they have done and scold them for what they failed to do. This is the day when Communist women feel the public tribute paid to them and when they are made to feel how important and how needed they are as a factor in building up communism. The wife is expected to influence her husband, the mother to educate the children, the working woman to speed up production to build the Communist state. Women in politics are expected to do a tremendous job as propaganda agents, as information agents, and as legislators to press for laws that aid the Communist plan.

On June 1 of each year the Communist-dominated world celebrates Children's Day on the national and international level. On this day they show the world "the wonderful Communist children"—loyal to the State, and so mature when they reach the age of 14 that they do not need the guidance of their parents any more. They are free to do what they please. At this time it becomes their right and duty to spy on their parents and to do all assignments given them by the party leaders.

I would urge you to read the readily available Communist pamphlets on the Education of Communist Youth, to understand what is actually being done to youth.

COMMUNIST MOTHER'S DAY

On the 18th of June, a matter of only a few weeks from now, Communist Mother's Day will be tuned to the note of hate of the West, and above all else, hate of America. And in July another World Congress of Mothers will be called. At this Congress an appeal will be addressed to all mothers everywhere—an emotional appeal—to ban atomic war, to stop "American imperialism" and its interference in the affairs of other countries. It will urge all mothers to work for peace and brotherly love among all nations. It will be beamed to the hearts of the mothers of the West—to the trusting women of the free world who listen eagerly to all voices in support of peace. But we women of America—yes, and our men as well—with women everywhere should listen intelligently. We should not permit ourselves to accept these high-sounding words until we have examined the kind of "peace" that is being offered us by the Communist leaders. We should be keenly aware that the Communist Mother's World Congress combines its channels of propaganda with those of the Vienna Peace Conference. We should be alert to see what a truly terrific outlet this gives with which to flood our press, etc. Somehow we must be prepared to refute this propaganda immediately and effectively, or we give the impression that what they say is true: that America is the aggressor and the warmonger, while Communists are doves of peace.

We who live in this free America—especially we who are women, whether we be mothers in fact or not—feel an especial urgency to bring to all people everywhere the realization of what the inevitable results will be should communism be able to becloud the true issues so thoroughly that women and men as well permit themselves to be taken in by their words.

What channels do we free people here in America have to counteract the floods upon floods of propaganda that are constantly poured over us and the increased flood that will be loosed on these special dates?

We have the United States Information Agency and we should use it more intelligently. We should see to it that it has the personnel and the tools to do a real job for us. I am thoroughly aware of the criticisms that have been hurled at it—some justified but much not justified—but it is our one general channel. Then there is Radio Free Europe that is doing much. We could concentrate our subject matter and refute the dove of peace of the hammer and sickle.

WOMEN FOR FREEDOM OF EUROPE

We have in our midst also a woman's group whose knowledge is far beyond our own, because it is drawn from personal experience and from the constant flow of information from the curtained countries that are theirs.

I speak of Women for Freedom of Europe, Inc. This organization at 8 West 40th Street, New York, is a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Its president is Geraldine Fitch; the chairman of its advisory board is Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, one of the finest representatives of American womanhood. These women have undertaken to study and analyze from first-hand information, the social changes introduced in these Communist and Communist-dominated lands, and to learn the effects of these changes upon the lives of women and their families. A seminar now in progress at the Baltic House of Freedom in New York City is giving out important information about the laws recently introduced in order to Sovietize the pattern of family life, the education of children—and again I urge you to read Lenin's brochure on the Education of Communist Youth—and the working conditions imposed upon women. We Americans should know more of the actual conditions. It is so difficult for us to picture such a situation. We do not realize how vital it is that we who are still free should work together to retain our freedom.

As you well know, Communist propaganda is constantly telling their own people and the world that only the U. S. S. R. works for peace—that America is responsible for all the war talk—all their need for ever more war strength. And they are good at it. Do not mistake that.

CONTRASTS IN PEACE EFFORTS

Let me review a few things which would seem not only to disprove their contentions, but to paint the picture in its true colors.

The historic record of the American people for peace stands despite the Communist labels of "warmonger" and "aggressor." The quick demobilization of the American forces after the war, tells clearly our dislike of war and love of peace. By contrast the whole Russian Army is still under arms and ready for action, with armies of the captive countries gradually integrated into a joint Soviet military plan. Drawn up this February by Soviet officiers and military delegates this plan designated Hungary, together with Bulgaria and Romania, as the second defense line. The delegates of the satellite states proposed that each country have its own military command with Soviet officers as "liaison." The Russians counterproposed that Russian military headquarters be set up in each country and their "proposal" was "accepted" by all the delegates, as the Minsk resolution. In view of the impending ratification of the Austrian Peace Treaty which implies withdrawal of Russian troops from Austria, Hungary and Romania, the Minsk resolution supplies another pretext for keeping the Russian armies in these countries.

After the Second World War the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan for international agency control of atomic production was blocked by Soviet veto in the United Nations. Also another generous effort for the sharing of "atoms-for-peace" was presented by President Eisenhower to the United Nations and accepted by the General Assembly in November 23, 1954.

Assistance was originated and largely underwritten by the United States through the Marshall plan, NATO, and the point four program for the underdeveloped countries. This is eloquent testimony of the American people's striving for world peace based on higher standards of living, with freedom and justice strengthened by economic security and without political influence.

In the treatment of former enemies America actually donated billions of dollars for the reconstruction of Japan and Italy, while Soviet Russia looted billions' worth from the captive countries. Today Japan is a free country, with its own foreign policy as is Western Germany.

I could name many more matters which show our good faith, and the Communist infidelities. But my purpose today is not tied to these things. My purpose is to draw the attention of all women to the need for intelligent thought and action lest we let the soft words of those who talk peace, deafen us to the steady and persistent beat of the drums of war from which they emanate.

Peace never comes easily for it is a quality of the heart, of the personality. The work for peace is not a matter of mass gatherings, and propaganda banners. The work for peace involves instead a constant vigilance against the slavery which the Soviets are forcing upon millions and millions of people in the name of peace.

We who are free women in a free land must keep faith with our own dedication to peace and also with the trust that women of the rest of the world have placed in American womanhood. We must recognize the false and stand firmly behind each true and since step toward a just and lasting peace.

Such a rededication of ourselves to the true meaning of freedom, which after all is our responsibility to the Infinite, can bring new meaning to our so-called Mother's Day. May we work unceasingly and humbly that freedom may be reborn across the world.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Even before I had the responsibility of chairmanship of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs having to do with national and international movements, the committee that drafted the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, I had concerned myself with communism and its teachings, it methods, its goals. Insofar as I have been able, I have followed the tragic history of those peoples and countries who are behind the curtain, hoping that other countries and other peoples might learn from these tragedies and not be engulfed.

Let me give you something of the history as it has been laid bare:

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Ever since World War I, as an active and loyal member of the League of Nations, Czechoslovakia kept a constant record for peace and international cooperation. Confronted by the increased Nazi menace, it supplemented its system of alliances with France and the Little Entente by a treaty with the Soviet Union in 1935, which was renewed in December 1943, and was clearly based on nonintervention by the U. S. S. R. in the internal affairs of the postwar Czechoslovak Republic. Yet, its genuine effort to promote European reconstruction and the work of the United Nations was abruptly ended by combined machinations of the Soviet Union and its Communist agents within. By a violent coup Czechoslovakia was deprived of its traditional role of working for peace, its democratic system was overthrown, and its people drawn into the orbit of Soviet slavery.

BALTIC STATES

Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, existed in peace with Russia ever since the establishment of their independence in 1918. In the course of good neighborliness, peace treaties were made, nonaggression pacts signed, and mutual-assistance treaties concluded. The mutual-assistance treaties were for a term of 15 years. Yet within 8 months these Baltic States fell under such ruthless occupation as history has seldom recorded.

In Estonia, according to verified data, about 60,000 persons were deported to the Soviet Union in 1940–41. About 2,000 men and women were executed on the spot; 9,229 of the deported or murdered were minors or children under 20 years of age. In 1949 a considerably larger number of people were deported than during the mass deportation in 1941.

In Latvia, during the first occupation in 1940–41, a total of 37,500 persons was deported. Including the subsequent deportations after the reoccupation of the country in 1944, the allover amount is far over 100,000 persons.

Since the first mass deportation of the horrible night of June 13–14 in 1941, in Lithuania, six other deportations have taken place, taking young people, fathers, mothers, and children. Eighty-three thousand Lithuanians were driven off in the early part of May 1945. In May 22, 1948, Lithuania lost more than 100,000 of her inhabitants in a single night.

DEPORTATIONS

Today deportations proceed under the guise of voluntary work in remote regions of Russia, where the deportees are forced to perform specified duties and labor voluntarily. They are forced to sign a statement that they are leaving voluntarily for work in such-and-such brotherly republic or autonomous district. At designated points, these deportees are classified, some to go to penal camps, some to forced labor, some to free exile, which covers women and children. The places of deportees are filled by newcomers from Russia. Recent escapees from Vorkuta and other camps bring news of thousands of those Balts, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Poles laboring unto death in the mines, railroad building, fisheries, and forests of the western Ural region.

This is the Communist peace that was accorded the Baltic States when they trusted the false independence, autonomy, and coexistence promised by the Soviets. Similar Soviet pattern was followed in other countries, like Bulgaria, which was also taken over, the Russian troops exercising pressure which gradually led to the transformation of the coalition cabinet in September 1944 into purely Communist government. From 1945 to 1947 thousands of members of the Peasant Party of the opposition in Parliament were imprisoned and their leader, Nicolas Petkoff, executed.

RUMANIA

Next was Rumania. On April 3, 1944, Molotov, the Soviet Minister of Soviet Affairs, in the course of the Rumanian armistice negotiations, made the following statement:

> The Soviet Government declares that it does not pursue the aim of conquering any part of Rumanian territory or of changing in whatever manner the existing social order in Rumania. It equally declares that the entry in Rumania of Soviet troops is solely the consequence of military necessities and of the continuation of resistance of the enemy troops.

This solemn statement was repeated by Molotov on August 23, 1944, when Rumania joined the allied forces:

> In the face of events in Rumania, the Soviet Government considers that it would not be without value to confirm the declaration it made in April this year, to the effect that the Soviet Union does not intend to appropriate any part of Rumania or to change the established social regime in that country, or, furthermore, to limit in any way whatever the independence of Rumania.

Almost at the same time, Vishinsky arrived in Rumania to overthrow the coalition government under the pressure of Russian tanks and force upon the country the Communist regime. Right now the Sovietskaya Moldavia of March 31, 1955, announced the planned displacement of the whole population of Bessarabia and Moldavia to Astrakhan, Rostof, and Pavlodar in Central Asia. One million six hundred thousand people, women and children and old people, are among those to be moved to a virgin cold region, where there is nothing but the bare frozen ground. These people are Rumanians, and the territory was incorporated in the U. S. S. R. at the peace treaty.

The same pattern was used in Hungary. In Hungary reports tell that in March 1955, while the Communists vigorously stepped up their peace campaign, the Government issued a decree stipulating that within a period of 14 days the enemies of the people be evicted from Budapest and other major cities.

The people of the captive countries have peace treaties, but they have no peace. Their countries have been looted under various pretexts. The misery and suffering of their people is hard to imagine by American standards. They have lost their freedom and are cut off from the rest of the world. Their people are subject to slavery, imprisonment, and mass deportation.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the peace the Communists offer the world.

Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Medical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government dealing with veterans' hospitals and benefits makes me think that the Commission was far more aptly named by the public in calling it the Hoover Commission than in its own formal title. The consideration shown our veterans in the Commission report, it seems to me, is comparable to that shown veterans under the Hoover administration at the time of the famed veterans bonus march on Washington.

It is true that, given the composition of the present Hoover Commission, as appointed by President Eisenhower, and the Republican leadership of the 83d Congress, we might have predicted that social welfare matters would be treated on a cold cash-and-carry basis, without regard for the human principles involved. The fact that as the Commission reports come out they go right down the line in recommending elimination or reduction of many such programs is not too surprising—in spite of the fact that the previous Commission, appointed under a Democratic administration, had adopted a much more sympathetic attitude toward social-welfare programs in general. It might be well in passing also to mention that the present Commission seems to have gone a long way out on the limb in the way of recommending changes in basic and fundamental policy without confining themselves to considerations involving organization of the executive agencies or administration of policy.

However, despite the bias of the Commission implicit in its membership, we might have hoped that they would soften their strict dollars-and-cents thinking in view of the tremendous debt the country owes to the veterans of our Armed Forces. Analysis of the report on medical services as it applies to veterans' hospitals and benefits shows, however, that this was not the case.

The Commission seems to have used as their yardstick for operation of veterans' hospital, as an example, the sole question of whether or not such a hospital can be "operated effectively and economically," with callous disregard for all the human and humane factors involved. Certainly their recommendation "that all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals be rescinded except for those now under construction or contract" shows a cynical attitude toward the situation in many areas of the country where hospital facilities are sadly lacking. The Commission calls attention to their claim that during the past 20 years all service-connected cases could have been taken care of in existing hospitals without any new construction as justification for their recommendation. Their other recommendations calling for a crackdown on hospitalization for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, coupled with this statement, give a clear indication of the Commission's feeling that the Federal Government should get out from under its strong moral and legal obligation to provide medical treatment for needy veterans unable to provide such treatment for themselves.

I know from personal experiences with hundreds of cases how difficult it is for any veteran to establish service connection for any of the ailments, physical and mental, which may attack him following his service. The Commission's recommendations for cutting down on non-service-connected cases, together with their recommendation to tighten up on the already strict criteria for establishing service connection, would work untold additional hardship on the many deserving veterans now denied adequate treatment because of faulty medical records maintained by the services, or because of the Administration's unwillingness to accept medical evidence indicating service connection unless the medical records for the veteran's period of service give proof positive that the specific ailment had its onset during the period.

This situation is particularly bad in cases where mental illnesses have occurred as an aftermath of wartime service although at the time of discharge the condition may not have been evident. In northern California alone, as an example, the existing Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital at Palo Alto has a waiting list of over 1,000 cases of veterans classified as non-service-connected crying for admission and the treatment they so badly need. In the meantime our State institutions or the families of the veterans must bear the burden. Yet, for almost 10 years the construction of another such hospital in the San Francisco area has been authorized, only to have construction delayed year after year on one excuse or another. Money has now been appropriated, but the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have not yet given the final all clear which would permit signing of contracts and start of construction. Presumably, if the Hoover Commission has its way, the construction would never be started, since, technically, these are non-service-connected cases. Yet I would like to know who would dare to stand up and say that, medical records or no, most of these cases are not the direct result of the wartime strains and stresses to which the individual veterans were subjected.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the Congress does not abrogate its own responsibility to make policy determinations on how far care for veterans should be extended. If I am any judge the Congress will give the inhumane recommendations of the Commission the treatment they deserve. I, for one, will oppose any move to put them into effect with few exceptions and will support consigning them, for the most part, to the waste-basket.