

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7824. A bill for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hal) and Moy Chun Ngan (Edith Moy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7825. A bill for the relief of 16 customs inspectors employed at the port of Honolulu, T. H., from liability for certain amounts paid and demand for refund thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7826. A bill for the relief of Chong Hyun Pak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 7827. A bill for the relief of Chuzo Tamotzu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7828. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hsun-Tiao Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 7829. A bill for the relief of Oscar Beregi, Sr., and Oscar Beregi, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7830. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Leiss Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7831. A bill for the relief of Maria V. Beregi de Pataky and Coloman de Pataky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 7832. A bill for the relief of Sueko Oshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7833. A bill for the relief of Daniel Souang and Michele Souang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 7834. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Kensdel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 7835. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7836. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Kondoleon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

360. Mr. HORAN presented a petition of 150 residents of the State of Washington urging that Congress exercise its powers to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of Interstate Commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Parliamentary Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on the date of July 12 you paid me the honor of appointing me 1 of the 6 Members of the House of Representatives to attend the First Parliamentary Conference of the NATO countries to be held in Paris, France, from July 18 to 22, inclusive.

The other members of the delegation appointed were Congressmen HAYS, of Ohio; ANFUSO, of New York; UDALL, of Arizona; JOHNSON, of California; and CRUMPACKER, of Indiana. In accordance with the resolutions adopted by the House, we left for France on Saturday, July 16. Starting on Monday morning, July 18, we attended the first session held at the Palais Chaillot.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it very important that Members of the Congress know what took place and the results of this Conference, as well as the feelings and individual reactions of the six Members of the House of Representatives who attended.

The Conference was called to order and selected Senator Wishart Robertson, of Canada, as president.

After the meeting was organized in the conference room where the 15 NATO countries were represented, the Conference got underway with a discussion of the amount of good arising from such meetings of the parliamentarians of the NATO countries.

It was agreed that no particular subject matter would be discussed other than this until such time as an approval could be had by the various parliaments and Congress to set up a permanent parliamentary conference to meet once a year.

After listening to these discussions for several days and having the opportunity of off-the-record discussions after the

formal sessions were over, I came to the absolute conclusion that a permanent organized conference of this kind would serve a great purpose, as all matters affecting NATO could be discussed by the members of parliaments and Congress, and a report made to the Congress by the delegates rather than the second-hand reports that we are now receiving.

I also had the opportunity to meet in a friendly way with the members of the various parliaments, putting everything on a very friendly basis.

One whole morning was spent at the headquarters of SHAPE where a complete briefing was given us by the following:

The Supreme Military Commander of NATO: Gen. Alfred Gruenther.

The deputy commanders: Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery, Gen. Pierre Brissac, Adm. Georgio Gay.

I could not help being extremely satisfied that this is a competent military defense organization for the free countries of Europe and the United States and that great strides have been made to prevent any aggression. I believe the organization of NATO and its military organization SHAPE under NATO is doing a very competent job of preserving the peace as well as promoting the economic welfare of the countries involved.

The final windup of the Conference was to adopt a resolution making the parliamentary conference a permanent organization. This resolution is to be submitted by the various delegates to their parliaments and Congress. Quite a discussion arose for the admittance of Spain into the NATO organization, and there was much favor in this regard.

The delegates of Portugal were going to press this point and there were several other matters the delegates believed were important to discuss, just as it was my firm intention to take up the matter of article VII of the Status of Forces Treaty whereby the agreement permits the prosecution of American GI's in foreign courts. However, due to the unanimous opinion of the parliamentarians that no discussion take place on matters affecting the treaty until a permanent organization was established, the other delegates and I agreed to set these matters aside.

In private discussions, however, I explored the matter and hope that sometime in the near future this matter will be discussed and some favorable action can be taken so that our GI's serving in foreign lands will have the full protection of the United States Constitution to which they are justly entitled.

I am sure this has the backing of the American people.

All 15 countries of NATO were represented by large delegations of their members of parliament, and there is no doubt in my mind whatever when I say to you in all sincerity that as members of legislative bodies everyone spoke very frankly. As the Conference developed, one could readily observe that any slight tensions that may have existed at the beginning of the Conference had completely disappeared. One could readily see that there was understanding and appreciation of the various parliaments of the member countries.

During the course of the week a special committee was appointed with one member from each delegation to draw up a resolution requesting their various parliaments to form a permanent NATO parliamentary organization, and several different resolutions were introduced. Out of these the committee reported unanimously a resolution which was adopted by the 15 delegations present. I am incorporating this resolution at this point:

This meeting of members of parliament from NATO countries:

Recalling that the aim of the North Atlantic Treaty is both to ensure the defense of member states and to contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the peoples united within the framework of the Atlantic Community;

Considering that achievement of the aims would be facilitated by closer relations between the members of the representative assemblies of the different countries and considering that this is particularly desirable in the case of the legislative branches of the member states who have by solemn treaty pledged themselves to the mutual defense and welfare of their respective peoples through the far-reaching initiative in international relations that is NATO;

Believing that these discussions between members and the NATO authorities and be-

tween members themselves have already been of great value;

Invites the speakers of the various parliaments concerned, according to the procedure which they think appropriate, to send delegations to a similar meeting each year.

Expresses the wish that the governments of the countries here represented facilitate through the NATO council further meetings.

Considers further that before we separate a continuing committee should be selected composed of the present officers and other members of the steering committee, 15 in number, to include 1 from each NATO nation and with the right of substitution to make arrangements for the next meeting.

This meeting further considers that such a continuing committee would require some secretarial assistance of its own. This should be, for the time being, on a part-time basis. The necessary finance, which should be quite small, should be provided by the participating governments or parliaments concerned on a basis to be mutually agreed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my very firm conviction and belief that we should participate in these parliamentary conferences where member delegates may hear the views and discuss the many problems that are in conflict today, even among the NATO countries. I feel positive that our delegates who attend these conferences would be in a very excellent position to explain to Congress, when legislation comes up whether it be in matters military or economic, the feeling of the parliaments of the other countries. A first-hand report on these matters at the proper time on the floor of the House, I am sure, will be helpful to all of the Members. I cannot help but feel that these discussions, ultimately, will bring about not only a fine relationship between the member countries but also gain the one and only desire, to halt Communist aggression.

I deeply appreciate the privilege that was given to me to represent this great House of Representatives at the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

### **They Speak Peace, but Mischief Is in Their Hearts**

#### **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

### **HON. GEORGE S. LONG**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, August 1, 1955*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the Western World has been witnessing a most remarkable spectacle. Soviet Russia, it seems, has set out upon a course to convince the world that it really does want peace. In every conceivable manner, Soviet leaders have taken pains to give the appearance of substance to the shadow of the long-heralded Stalin "peace" offensive. No efforts have been spared to show the world that the men in the Kremlin are really reasonable, peace-loving, and trustworthy men.

However, peace—a real peace as we interpret its meaning—in order to be lasting, must be based upon trust, confidence, and mutual good faith. These are fundamental requirements for peace. I would like to believe that the Soviets want a real peace because the alterna-

tive—war in the hydrogen age—raises a specter of horror. But I cannot believe that the leaders of the Soviet Union meet the requirements necessary for the attainment of a real peace; that is to say, trust, confidence, and good faith. They have never been trustworthy. They cannot be trusted now. The long catalog of broken treaties and agreements concluded during the existence of the Soviet regime is convincing evidence of that fact. The Bible tells us, in the words of King David, in the 28th Psalm:

Take me not off with the wicked, with those who are workers of evil, who speak peace with their neighbors, while mischief is in their hearts.

Unlike the freedom-inspired nations of the world whose foreign policies are rooted in the desire to live at peace, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is a military campaign, the ultimate objective of which is world conquest. To the Soviet leaders peace is never absolute; it is never an end in itself. The political philosophy of the Soviet State is not based upon the concept of good-will toward men, but rather it is based on the belief that all mankind is at war with itself, that the millennium will come only with the conquest of the world by communism. Communists thrive on conflict, disorder, and disharmony, and when they seek peace it is not as a permanent goal. To them peace is a tactical weapon. It is only a diversionary tactic to gain time to recoup their energies before striking with greater force.

The recent conference at Geneva was a major attempt of the Soviet leaders to demonstrate to the world their new policy of peaceful co-existence. Meeting the most powerful leaders in the West, Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov, and Zhukov did their utmost to convince them and the entire world of their sincere desire for peace. Indeed, the leaders of the Soviet Union came to Geneva with a smile on their faces, but there was malice in their hearts. At every turn they gave the appearance of sweet reasonableness but they conceded nothing in the course of this conference. From their mouths which have spewed forth some of the most vicious, libelous, and malicious criticism of the West, and especially of the United States, there came forth now the honeyed propaganda platitudes of the peace campaign.

What was accomplished at Geneva? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. All the Soviet leaders did after a week of talking was to create the illusion of agreement.

On the surface, Soviet tactics have changed, but while Soviet tactics have changed Soviet strategy goes on unchanged. The Soviet Union seeks world conquest; it seeks the destruction of all the positions of strength created at such great cost in time, energy, and treasure by the United States and the West; it seeks, above all else, the destruction of the United States. Let it never be forgotten that America is the principal adversary of the Soviet Union. This Nation, first and foremost, restrains the predatory ambitions of the Soviet leaders. Let it never be forgotten that the threat of war is always with us so long as the Communists do not cleanse their hearts.

In the months ahead America must be on guard. We must view all these current Soviet gestures of amity with caution and with realism. Let the President remember those wise words of King David:

Take me not off with the wicked, with those who are workers of evil, who speak peace with their neighbors, while mischief is in their hearts.

The United States should keep wide awake because the soft tones could be a Russian lullaby.

We permit ourselves to be drawn into talks with Russia. It is like playing with a rattlesnake in its coil. No good can come of it and we are bound to get hurt.

### **Remanufacture of Imported Watches To Increase Their Jewel Count**

#### **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

### **HON. J. GLENN BEALL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, August 1, 1955*

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in view of recent discussions concerning the proposed bill H. R. 7466, which would prohibit the remanufacture of imported watches to increase their jewel count, the following is an excellent analysis made by the Tariff Commission under date of July 28, 1955. This report points out a number of weaknesses in the bill and stresses that it would establish a new precedent in customs procedures as well as "a departure from the general principle of encouraging processing of imported articles in the United States." The study further warns that "in practical effect, such increases in rates of duty would be the equivalent of internal taxes," that "the administration of the measure would involve added burdens not only on customs officers but also on importers" and that even "the title of the bill is incorrect."

I ask unanimous consent to have this analysis made a part of today's RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,  
Washington, July 28, 1955.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
WAYS AND MEANS ON H. R. 7466 AND H. R.  
7467, IDENTICAL BILLS TO AMEND PARAGRAPH  
367 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 WHICH DE-  
FINES SUBSTITUTES FOR JEWELS IN IMPORTED  
WATCH MOVEMENTS

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The proposed legislation, if enacted, would amend paragraph 367 (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to read as follows (new language italicized):

"(1) For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph 368 the term 'jewel' includes substitutes for jewels. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'substitutes for jewels' includes, without limitation, each place in any movement, mechanism, device, instrument, assembly, or subassembly where a jewel (as defined in the preceding sentence) is placed or inserted and serves a mechanical purpose as a frictional bearing, whether such jewel is so placed or inserted in a foreign trade zone (notwithstanding the provisions



of the act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C., secs. 81a-81u)), or in a bonded warehouse or otherwise in customs custody, or (except for the purposes of subparagraph (b) of this paragraph and paragraph 368 (b)) elsewhere within the United States within 3 years after the date of release from customs custody. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make regulations to enforce or otherwise carry out the provisions of this subparagraph, which regulations may include provision for any bond, and for any declaration or other form of proof, he deems necessary."

The amendment would "enter into force as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this act."

The proposed legislation is designed as a deterrent to "upjeweling" imported watch movements in the United States, which practice domestic producers of jeweled watch movements claim to be prejudicial to the sale of their watches having more than 17 jewels. This practice involves the importation of jeweled movements and converting them in the United States into movements with a larger number of jewels. A number of years ago, a practice developed of upjeweling in the United States imported movements with 1 jewel to movements with 7 jewels, but subsequent trade-agreement reductions in rates of duty and rising costs of such upjeweling brought the practice to an end. In recent years, upjeweling has been confined principally to converting important movements with 17 jewels to movements with as many as 25.

The earlier practices of upjeweling involved rather substantial processing in the United States. The imported movement had to be disassembled, the plates and bridges jeweled, markings changed, the parts reassembled into a movement, and the movement timed. In recent years upjeweling has been facilitated by technological developments in the watchmaking field, such as the Duo-Fix and similar devices. The utilization of such devices not only has facilitated upjeweling but also has improved the quality of the finished product.

#### RELATIONSHIP OF UPJEWELING TO TARIFF TREATMENT OF IMPORTED WATCH MOVEMENTS

The only important incentive to upjeweling at present is the wide disparity in tariff rates applicable to movements with 17 or fewer jewels and those with more than 17 jewels. The attached table 1 sets forth the rates of duty prescribed in paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified, on watch movements, assemblies, and subassemblies, and parts. The rates on all movements having 17 or fewer jewels (or none at all) vary according to the size of the movement, jewel count, the number of adjustments, whether the movement is designed to operate for a period in excess of 47 hours without re-winding, or is self-winding, or could accommodate a self-winding device. The highest rate possible on a 17-jewel movement totals \$9.10, computed as follows:

On a movement not over 0.6 inch in width, inclusive of 7 jewels.....	\$2.50
For the 10 additional jewels.....	1.35
For 9 adjustments <sup>1</sup> .....	4.50
For self-winding feature.....	.75
	<hr/> 9.10

<sup>1</sup>Includes 1 adjustment for isochronism, 2 for temperature, and 6 for position. Although 6 position adjustments are possible, even very high-quality watches ordinarily have no more than 5 adjustments.

Most watches that enter the country are marked unadjusted and are being admitted without the assessment of adjustment duties. All movements having more than 17 jewels are dutiable at \$10.75 each, regardless of size, adjustments, etc. As long as the duty on a movement with more than 17 jewels appreciably exceeds that on a movement with 17 jewels, plus the cost of converting such movement into 1 with 18 or more jewels, the incentive to upjewel will exist.

The Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department issued a ruling (T. D. 53753) on March 16, 1955, that watch movements specially engineered, constructed, designed, or prepared to facilitate upjeweling after importation by omission of jewels and substitution therefor of metal caps, bearings, bushings, or bouchons contain "substitutes for jewels" within the meaning of paragraph 367 (i) in each position customarily occupied by a genuine or synthetic jewel but in which a metal cap, bearing, bushing, or bouchon has been placed at the time the movements were prepared for exportation to the United States. The ruling, which became effective in June, may deter certain upjeweling practices encountered in recent years. However, it is no deterrent whatsoever with respect to other practices involving movements which, at the time of importation, have no "substitute" jewels in the places in the movements where the real or synthetic jewels are ultimately installed after importation into the United States.

#### ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The bills under consideration propose to meet the problem of upjeweling by defining the term "substitutes for jewels" in paragraph 367 (i) to include "each place" in a movement where a jewel or substitute for a jewel "is placed or inserted and serves a mechanical purpose as a frictional bearing, whether such jewel is so placed or inserted in a foreign trade zone \* \* \*, or in a bonded warehouse or otherwise in customs custody, or \* \* \* elsewhere within the United States within 3 years after the date of release from customs custody." Approaching the problem in terms of a solution based upon a completely arbitrary definition of the term "substitutes for jewels" is both indirect and confusing. A substitute for a jewel is a "thing," not a "place." The present definition of "jewel" in paragraph 367 (i) as including "substitutes for jewels," when coupled with the proposed definition of "substitutes for jewels" as including "each place" in a movement where a "jewel" is inserted or placed, literally could mean that a "jewel" is a "place" where a "place" is inserted or placed. This absurdity could be overcome and the substance in the first two sentences of the proposed paragraph 367 (i) could be more clearly and accurately stated if the following language was substituted:

"(i) For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph 368, (1) the term 'jewel' includes substitutes for jewels, and (2) any duties assessable shall be computed on the basis of the total number of jewels, so defined, as are incorporated into any movement, mechanism, device, instrument, assembly, or subassembly at any time prior to, or within 3 years after, the date of release from customs custody of such movement, mechanism, device, instrument, assembly, or subassembly."

However, even if the language of the bills was clarified as above indicated, there would still be involved a departure from the general principle that imported articles are classified for tariff purposes according to their character and condition at the time of importation. To the extent that the proposed legislation would increase duty rates

by reason of upjeweling in the United States, the duty would not be one which is imposed upon, or by reason of, the importation of the movements, but rather one which is imposed upon domestic processing of the imported movements. This, again, represents a departure from the general principle of encouraging processing of imported articles in the United States. In practical effect, such increases in rates of duty would be the equivalent of internal taxes.

The Commission is not unmindful of the various provisions in the tariff laws which make the actual use of imported articles in the United States determinative of their tariff status. As far as the Commission is aware, however, all such provisions which have been enacted in the past grant preferred tariff treatment to certain classes of goods used (or processed) in certain ways in the United States and are clearly distinguishable from a provision such as is proposed in the bills under consideration which would affirmatively impose increased rates of duty on imported articles by reason of processing applied in this country after their release from customs custody.

To the extent that the proposed legislation would provide for increased rates of duty on watch movements by reason of their being upjeweled in the United States, such legislation, if enacted, would be inconsistent with obligations of the United States under the Swiss trade agreement, unless the President took the action which is provided for in section 2 of the bills.

Since almost any of the watch movements being imported with not over 17 jewels could be upjeweled in the United States after release from customs custody to movements with over 17 jewels, the administration of the measure would involve added burdens not only on customs officers but also on importers, including those who had no intention of participating in, or being a party to, upjeweling transactions.

Effectively plugging up tariff loopholes is often difficult. Legislation may overcome tariff avoidance practices previously encountered, but may not sufficiently anticipate potential new practices which importers may devise. The Commission wonders, for example, whether defining a substitute for a jewel as a "place" in a movement where a jewel is "placed or inserted" is adequate to provide for a domestic processing involving the complete substitution in the United States of a bridge with, say, two or more jewels for a jewelless bridge in the imported movement. In such a situation, the question would be whether jewels per se are placed or inserted in the movement. It also seems possible that importers might find in the provisions of paragraph 1615 (g), Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, a feasible method of avoiding the full impact of the \$10.75 duty on watch movements having more than 17 jewels. Paragraph 1615 (g), as amended, provides for partial exemption from duty in the case of (1) any article returned to the United States after having been exported for repairs or alterations, and (2) any article of metal (except precious metal) manufactured in the United States or subjected to a process of manufacture in the United States, exported for further processing, and thereafter returned to the United States for further processing. Articles within the purview of paragraph 1615 (g) are dutiable only on the value of the processing done abroad.

The title of the bills is incorrect. It indicates that paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930 defines substitutes for jewels in imported watch movements. Paragraph 367 contains no such definition at the present time.

TABLE 1.—Rates of duty on watch movements, assemblies and subassemblies, and parts

Paragraph No.	Description	Full rate <sup>1</sup>	Reduced rate <sup>2</sup>
367 (a)	Watch movements, and time-indicating, time-keeping, or time-measuring devices, instruments, and mechanisms, whether or not designed to be carried or worn on or about the person; all the foregoing, if under 1.77 inches wide, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings:		
(2)	Having no jewels or only 1 jewel and in width—		
	Not over 0.6 inch.....	\$1.50 each.....	\$1.35 each.
	Over 0.6 but not over 0.8 inch.....	\$1.35 each.....	\$1.12½ each.
	Over 0.8 but not over 0.9 inch.....	\$1.20 each.....	\$1.12½ each.
	Over 0.9 but not over 1 inch.....	\$1.05 each.....	\$1.05 each.
	Over 1 but not over 1.2 inches.....	93 cents each.....	93 cents each.
	Over 1.2 but not over 1.5 inches.....	84 cents each.....	84 cents each.
	Over 1.5 inches.....	75 cents each.....	
(1)	Having over 1 but not over 17 jewels and in width—		
	Not over 0.6 inch.....	\$2.50 each.....	\$2.50 each.
	Over 0.6 but not over 0.8 inch.....	\$2.25 each.....	\$2.02½ each.
	Over 0.8 but not over 0.9 inch.....	\$2 each.....	\$2 each.
	Over 0.9 but not over 1 inch.....	\$1.75 each.....	\$1.75 each.
	Over 1 but not over 1.2 inches.....	\$1.55 each.....	\$1.35 each.
	Over 1.2 but not over 1.5 inches.....	\$1.40 each.....	\$1.35 each.
	Over 1.5 inches.....	\$1.25 each.....	\$1.25 each.
(3)	Any of the foregoing having over 7 jewels shall be subject to an additional duty of.....	15 cents for each jewel over 7.....	13½ cents for each jewel over 7.
(4)	Any of the foregoing shall be subject for each adjustment of whatever kind (treating adjustment to temperature as two adjustments), in accordance with the marking as hereinafter provided for, to an additional duty of.....	\$1 for each adjustment.....	50 cents for each adjustment.
(5)	Any of the foregoing constructed or designed to operate for over 47 hours without rewinding, or if self-winding, or if a self-winding device may be incorporated therein, shall be subject to an additional duty of.....	\$1 each.....	75 cents each.
	Any of the foregoing having under 7 jewels and having a bushing or its equivalent (other than a substitute for a jewel) in any position customarily occupied by a jewel shall be subject to.....	The full rates specified above in respect of such article.	
(6)	Having over 17 jewels.....	\$10.75 each.....	
(b)	All the foregoing shall have cut, die sunk, or engraved, conspicuously and indelibly on 1 or more of the bridges or top plates: The name of the country of manufacture; the name of the manufacturer or purchaser; in Arabic numerals and in words the number of jewels, if any, serving a mechanical purpose as frictional bearings; and, in Arabic numerals and in words, the number and classes of adjustments, or, if unadjusted, the word "unadjusted."		
(c) (1)	Parts for any of the foregoing (except bottom or pillar plates or their equivalent, bridges or their equivalent, and jewels) imported in the same shipment with complete movements, devices, instruments, or mechanisms provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph (whether or not suitable for use in such articles), but not including all the parts in such shipment which exceed in value 4 percent of the value of such complete articles).....	45 percent ad valorem.....	
(2)	Bottom or pillar plates, or their equivalent.....	½ the duty for the complete article for which suitable.	½ the current duty for the complete article.
(3)	Assemblies and subassemblies (unless dutiable under (c) (1) above) consisting of 2 or more parts or pieces of metal or other material fastened or joined together:		
	Balance assemblies.....	50 cents per assembly.....	35 cents per assembly.
	For the purposes of this subdivision a balance assembly shall be an assembly consisting of a balance staff, balance wheel, and hairspring, with or without other parts commercially known as parts of a balance assembly.		
	Other:		
	For any jewels therein.....	15 cents per jewel.....	9 cents per jewel.
	For any bottom or pillar plates or their equivalent therein.....	The rate specified in (c) (2) above.....	The current rate in (c) (2) above.
	For other parts or pieces of metal or other material fastened or joined together therein (bimetallic balance wheels which are not parts of balance assemblies, and mainsprings with riveted ends, each to be considered as 1 part or piece).....	3 cents for each part or piece.....	2 cents for each part or piece.
	The duty on any assembly or subassembly shall be.....	Not more than the duty for the complete article for which suitable, and not less than 45 percent ad valorem.	Same rule applied to current rates.
(4)	Other parts (except jewels).....	65 percent ad valorem.....	55 percent ad valorem.
(d)	Jewels suitable for use in any article dutiable under this paragraph or par. 368, or in any compass or meter.	10 percent ad valorem.....	
(e)	Dials under 1.77 inches wide, for any article provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph, and imported separately.	5 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem.....	2½ cents each and 45 percent ad valorem.
	Dials for any articles provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph, whether or not attached thereto, shall have cut, die sunk, engraved, or stamped, conspicuously and indelibly thereon the name of the country of manufacture; which marking, if the dial is imported attached to any of the foregoing articles, shall be placed on the face of the dial in such manner as not to be obscured by any part of the case, container, or housing.		
(f)	Cases, containers, or housings designed or suitable for containing any article provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph, whether or not containing such articles, and whether complete or incomplete, finished or unfinished (except containers used for shipping purposes only):		
(1)	Made of gold or platinum.....	75 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem.....	75 cents each and 30 percent ad valorem.
(2)	In part of gold, platinum, or silver, or wholly of silver.....	40 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem.....	40 cents each and 30 percent ad valorem.
(3)	Set with precious, semiprecious, or imitation precious or semiprecious stones, or prepared for the setting of such stones.....	Do.....	Do.
(4)	Of base metal and not containing gold, platinum, or silver.....	20 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem.....	10 cents each and 25 percent ad valorem.
(5)	Any of the foregoing cases, containers, or housings, if enameled, shall be subject to an additional duty of.....	15 percent ad valorem.....	
(g)	The foregoing cases, containers, and housings shall have cut, die sunk, or engraved, conspicuously and indelibly on the inside of the back cover, the name in full of the manufacturer or purchaser and the name of the country of manufacture.		
(h)	For the purposes of this paragraph the width of any movement, device, instrument, or mechanism shall be the shortest surface dimension through the center of the bottom or pillar plate, or its equivalent, not including in the measurement any portion not essential to the functioning of the movement or other article.		
(i)	For the purposes of this paragraph and par. 368 the term "jewel" includes substitutes for jewels.		
(j)	An article required by this paragraph to be marked shall be denied entry unless marked in exact conformity with the requirements of this paragraph.		

<sup>1</sup> Rate provided for in Tariff Act of 1930.<sup>2</sup> Rate currently in effect under Swiss trade agreement. This column includes increased rates proclaimed by the President in July 1954 on most of the movements

in par. 367 (a), as a result of "escape clause" proceedings under sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.



### Swiss Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Swiss became free on that historic August 1, 1291, when they declared to the Hapsburg monarchy and other tyrants that the cantons of Schwyz, Uri and Nidwalden were joined in an everlasting league against external oppressors. Later, this freedom was extended to include 19 other cantons to make for today's total of 22.

When the Swiss and the Americans signed their Treaty of Friendship and Commerce on November 25, 1850, there was cause for rejoicing in both these freedom-loving lands on either side of the Atlantic. The Swiss Government then hailed the pact as a treaty of friendship whereby the two freest people on earth will treat each other reciprocally on a footing of equality.

Five months before, in a letter to the United States plenipotentiary negotiating the treaty in Bern, United States Secretary of State Clayton characterized the attitude of the United States in these words:

We regard as brothers and benefactors of the human family those enlightened patriots in continental Europe, who have continued steadfast in their purpose to give to their countrymen such permanent institutions as Washington and his contemporaries gave to America.

Switzerland and America have much in common despite the discrepancies in size and language, although many Americans still speak the major tongues spoken in Switzerland—French, German, and Italian.

Both nations have similar constitutions. They enjoy the highest standards of living in the world. Both believe in individualism, but maintain stable governments. Their national governments were created to serve the people and not the other way around.

Like the Americans, too, the Swiss have a keen competitive spirit. For the Swiss, the manufacture and sale of fine watches, precision instruments and fabrics play a major role because Switzerland has no natural resources to speak of. Consequently, the money needed to buy goods abroad must be made through high competence in manufacturing.

The Swiss, therefore, have sold us their precision goods and timepieces, and bought from us farm products, tobacco, automobiles, and other manufactures. And the trade balance in favor of the United States was nearly half a billion dollars in the years from 1936 to 1953.

But, since last year, a higher tariff on Swiss watches threatens to impair this favorable trade picture. Swiss watch sales in the United States went off about 30 percent in the 6 months following the tariff increase, and Switzerland is looking elsewhere for markets with the

likelihood that it will switch some of its buying, too.

American protectionists, claiming that our watch industry is essential to the defense of the United States, were successful in getting the President to sign a bill raising the tariff wall 50 percent higher. Yet, it was revealed months later that Defense Department experts had declared that no special nor preferential treatment was owing to the watch interests here.

### The Abandoned Farmer

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am this morning in receipt of a letter from a Missouri farmer in which he says the price of hogs is lower than a snake's belly in a wagon rut. And he points out that when the price of hogs is down, the price of corn follows.

He says the price of wheat is under pressure but the railroads are charging more to ship it than ever before and then not supply half enough cars and his wheat is dumped out on the ground waiting and deteriorating until the railroads get good and ready to haul it to market.

He insists that the Department of Agriculture has done nothing for the farmer since they decided to get rid of the family sized farm and plough under the small farmer and his children. He offers to trade Secretaries with the Department of Labor and wants a Secretary that will raise farm prices every time they raise union wages.

He also is willing, he tells me, to trade some farm Congressmen for a few of these city labor Congressmen that are doing such a wonderful job getting everybody's pay raised except the pay of the farmers who work harder and longer hours and render a more indispensable service than anybody else in the Nation.

He says these "danged Congressmen" over here in Washington are raising city pay so high that they are drawing all the farm labor into the city and he must rely on machinery to work his farm—and then they raise the price of farm machinery, and everything else the farmer uses, so high, and pay him so little, for what his farm produces that he does not have money to buy the machinery.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Secretary will ease up a little on the farmer and let him have enough income to at least keep his head above water in this wonderful prosperity and high wages and high prices everybody else in the country is enjoying except the farmer.

And speaking very seriously, Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the fact that the farm Congressmen have throughout this session cooperated with the labor Congressmen in securing fair wages and adequate living conditions for the wage earners of the Nation. We did

so because we feel that agriculture has a common cause with labor. Both are exploited by the same predatory interests. But turnabout is fair play and we hope that in the next session labor will return the favor and support legislation insuring a fair share of the national income to the farm men and farm women who are feeding the Nation more bountifully today than ever before in the history of America.

### Tribute To Harry M. Farrell, Late Enrolling Clerk of the House

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a tribute to Harry M. Farrell, late enrolling clerk of the House.

Fresh from service in the Army of the United States, in which he served from 1917 to 1919, Harry M. Farrell began his service with the House of Representatives on July 4, 1919. His loyal, intelligent application to duty soon marked him as a capable, efficient employee of the Congress. His capacity for service was of the highest order and never varied during his long devoted career. He made notable and conspicuous progress in this chosen field as a servant of the legislative establishment.

Just prior to being placed on the roll of the House as Assistant Librarian, under the Clerk of the House, he assisted in establishing the first gymnasium for Members in the space now occupied by the legislative counsel. He was the first instructor in the gymnasium. Nature had well equipped this fine young man with a splendid physique. He had been an outstanding football player in college. Endowed with powerful shoulders he was a fast, natural boxer. Among the Members he engaged in boxing bouts with in the new gym was the former lightweight champion of the Navy, the late Honorable Fred A. Britten, who was then a prominent Member of the House and later to become chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Harry Farrell was possessed of a keen mind and strong character. He was direct in his conversations and his ready wit revealed the power of his intellect. His dry humor was intermingled with the vitality with which he tackled his duties every day.

From Assistant Librarian he was appointed assistant enrolling clerk, April 10, 1921. He became enrolling clerk of the House March 1, 1924, by appointment by the late Hon. William Tyler Page, then Clerk of the House. It was in this highly technical field of service to the House of Representatives that the mental stamina and infinite patience served him well, for it is in these little observed but highly important functions of the enrolling clerk where the slightest

error may disrupt the legislative path of actions by the Congress. He justified the confidence of his trust and is said to have been one of the most capable enrolling clerks ever to have served the House.

From December 31, 1931, until February 20, 1947, there occurred a break in his service with the House. During this period he was employed by the Department of Agriculture. Two years after his return to the enrolling clerk's position the House of Representatives created, on January 27, 1949, the position of minority enrolling clerk, in which capacity he served during the time his party was in the minority.

His death in Washington on June 24, 1955, removes from the service organization of the House one of the finest, most able, and steadfastly loyal servants of the House of Representatives. He will be missed by us all but his pattern will be remembered and is worthy of emulation.

### TVA Power Financing

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I made before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on the TVA power financing bill, on July 27, 1955.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LISTER HILL BEFORE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON TVA POWER FINANCING BILL, JULY 27, 1955

It is with a deep sense of responsibility to the record of the past and a keen awareness of the challenge of the future that I appear before this committee. You are considering important legislation affecting TVA. This is, I believe, the first time in 15 years that TVA has requested an amendment of its statute to adapt that basic charter to changing times and circumstances. The managers of this public-power system have come to this committee, composed of the elected representatives of the people who are the owners of the system, and have recommended that TVA be authorized to issue bonds to finance additional power-producing facilities. They are asking the committee and the Congress to sanction the use of higher-cost capital, at the same time stating their belief that the objectives of the act can continue to be promoted even though future capital additions are financed from bond proceeds, and not solely from earnings and appropriations by the Congress.

Now I have great confidence in the staff which developed the plan approved by the board of TVA, and which is, with minor changes, embodied in the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR. I feel a deep sense of gratitude to the management of TVA, for they have translated into an unrivaled record of achievement the hopes and the faith written into the TVA statute when it was adopted in 1933. I was one of the authors of the act creating TVA.

Today, I am the only Member of the Congress who served on the conference committee appointed to adjust the differences between the House and Senate when the TVA Act was adopted. I am the only one who has had the satisfaction of participating year by year in the consideration of legislation affecting TVA, first as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, later from my seat on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Although my voice alone can be heard today, I know I speak for those who were my colleagues on the committees of the conference—for the great and lonely Senator from Nebraska, George Norris, who had the vision of this vast development first and who labored unceasingly for its realization. I know I speak for the late distinguished Senator from Oregon, Charles L. McNary, who gave his unwavering support to TVA, for the late Senator Kendrick, of Wyoming—for all of them—when I say that the reality of TVA's accomplishments has outstripped our dreams. Every member of this committee knows how often the result is otherwise.

If the committee will tolerate a little reminiscence, I should like to remind you that TVA is peculiarly a child of Congress. The TVA statute was not one of the many measures recommended by the Executive and adopted in early 1933 to meet the desperate emergencies of the depression. Twice in the preceding decade legislation foreshadowing the act of 1933 had been adopted by the Congress after extended hearings and debate. Twice such legislation had failed to receive the approval of the President. It was in Congress, not in the executive departments or the Office of the President, that the ideas embodied in TVA were developed. It was in the committees and on the floor of Congress that the act was written section by section, and I must confess when I reread it, I recognize the scars which bear testimony to the long and patient construction. It is not a slick job of professional drafting. It is prolix and repetitious. Its provisions were modified, strengthened and agreed to after weeks and months of public debate. The TVA idea was not conceived in secret meetings between persons who might be benefited.

TVA was not born out of selfish or sectional interest nor was it the conception of a single political party. The leaders in the fight to conserve the war properties at Muscle Shoals for the people and to make them the nucleus of a great development were not at first representatives of the area concerned. Nor were they members of the political party dominant in the area. We of the South joined statesmen from the Great Plains and the mountainous West, and the bipartisan support which had been cemented through more than 10 years' struggle in the Congress stood firmly together in 1933 as we endeavored to create a nonpartisan, nonpolitical, independent agency to undertake the development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley region for all the people's benefit. We were deeply concerned that politics should be kept out of TVA. Congress laid down the basic policies in the act with bipartisan accord. We wanted to make certain that those policies could be changed only by Congress and after public debate. So we made TVA an independent agency, corporate in form. We gave its board staggered terms of 9 years each and required of them a special oath of belief in TVA. We added a section then unique in Federal legislation, requiring that "no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency" (sec. 6).

In many respects the agency created was unique. To the best of my knowledge, TVA is still the only Federal agency directed by

its statute to see the job of resource development as a whole, to consider the interrelation of land and water, of forests and mines, to unify and give leadership to a regional effort. There was nothing particularly new about most of the responsibilities assigned to TVA, particularly those related to water control. Other rivers had been made navigable through the expenditure of public funds. Flood control was not a novelty. Electricity was being produced at dams owned by the Federal Government, and distributed by preference customers to individual consumers. Federal programs of various sorts for the conservation of natural resources were being undertaken throughout the country in 1933. The tasks were not new, but the kind of agency we created to carry out the policies adopted was different.

We departed from the conventional Federal pattern of administration in many ways. Most importantly, we meant the TVA to be a bulwark against the steady push of centralization. Even then we realized, and increasingly we know today, too many decisions are made in Washington; too many papers are required; too much is decided by remote control. The men who decide are too far from the problems. In the TVA Act we specified that the headquarters of the Board should be located in the region, away from Washington, close to the work to be undertaken. We tried our best to make the Board's authority equal to its responsibility, to place the power of decision in its hands. We did not visualize its members as errand boys subservient to centralized control in Washington. We wanted to be able to hold the Board accountable for results. So we put TVA employees outside the regular classified civil service. We placed responsibility upon the Board directly for the selection, the training, the promotion, and the compensation of its employees, for the purchase and the sale of land and equipment. We permitted the agency to sue and be sued in the courts.

We were firm about policy in the act, clear, I believe, although at times perhaps verbose, about objectives, but we were silent on details. We did not try to foresee every situation which might develop and to prescribe the course of action to be pursued. So far as power production was concerned, we made clear that power was to be regarded as a tool—just as the fertilizer the Board was directed to produce at Muscle Shoals would be a tool, just as the navigation channel would be a tool—a tool to develop the economy of the area, to raise the standard of living of the people, to expand the economic opportunities of the men and women living in the region. TVA was intended to be a demonstration for the Nation of what can happen when power is so regarded, when rates are established at levels designed to promote abundant use and general economic growth and not to provide a maximum of earnings for the power systems' owners. TVA was intended to show what can be accomplished when there is a conscious effort to keep costs down—capital costs, operating costs, all the way from the generator to the consumer.

I have been disturbed a little recently because it seems to me that these basic objectives of the TVA power program might be forgotten in preoccupation with the financial success of its operations. I am proud, of course, when it is reported that TVA has earned an average of 4 percent on the power investment over more than 20 years, for I learned long ago that generation and transmission is the least lucrative end of the power business, and that is the part owned and operated by TVA. The distribution is by the municipalities and the REA cooperatives. I am immensely gratified to know that by the end of the current fiscal year TVA will have paid into the Treasury more than \$200 million out of power earnings.



But I am distressed when I read testimony or hear statements which indicate that because TVA, like privately owned power systems, shows a good record of net earnings accruing to its owner, it has assumed some kind of obligation to emulate the practices of private power companies in all respects. With all the earnestness I can command, let me suggest that TVA has a higher end to serve. The devoted efforts of the many men who labored for so many years would be dishonored if TVA came to be judged by the extent to which its financial structure, and its operating costs, resemble those of privately owned utility companies. That is not the objective of TVA. The reverse should be true.

When we worked to create the statute section by section, so far as power was concerned we hoped we were building something that would stand as a beacon, a goal for the private power companies to approach. TVA was created for a public purpose. It must be judged by the degree to which that purpose is upheld. We told TVA to make electricity available to the greatest number of consumers at the lowest possible cost, and to have particular concern for the domestic and farm consumer. You know that we have seen the percentage of electrified farms rise from 3 to 93, and the use of electricity on the farm increased from under 10 million kilowatt-hours to 1.5 billion kilowatt-hours a year. We have seen the total number of consumers in the area now served by TVA rise from 275,000 to 1,350,000 and the average use of domestic consumers increase from 600 kilowatt-hours to about 5,000 kilowatt-hours a year. We have seen this area become the best appliance market in the country, and we know what that means in terms of living standards. This committee has heard the record from those representatives of TVA best qualified to tell it. Those are the figures that record the degree to which objectives have been realized. Those are the objectives which must be safeguarded as TVA moves to revenue bond financing. This Nation needs the TVA power system. Power consumers all over the country need it to lead the way, to pioneer in new ways to make electricity serve the people. To show what happens when the owners of a system direct that its operation shall be wholly in the public interest. That is the idea of the yardstick.

We talked about the yardstick endlessly when the creation of TVA was under consideration. I am startled now when I hear it interpreted by private-power spokesmen from the platform, over the air, and on my television screen. If I have not exhausted the committee's patience, let me explain just how we intended the operations of TVA to benefit consumers all over the country. Let me describe the problem we were facing. In the Nation as a whole there was too little electricity and consumers were paying too much. That was generally agreed. But no one knew what people should be paying, what a fair rate should be, a rate which would cover all the costs of operation which a prudent owner would incur and provide a fair return on the investment. Then, as now, the power business was by nature a monopoly free from the disciplines of competitive business. It had to be regulated in the public interest.

But the regulatory commissions were handicapped. They were limited in jurisdiction, and frequently concerned solely with restrictions on the rate of return earned by the companies after operating costs had been met. Nobody had the data to judge whether operating costs were accurately reported or prudently incurred. There was a special mystery about the costs of power distribution as distinguished from generation and transmission.

The truth is that nobody, including the private utilities, appeared to know how their rates were established and what their costs

really were. They just knew they were making money. We did not know what TVA's costs would be, nor at what level rates should be set. We simply had faith that the principle of low rates and high use would work. We prescribed protection against some of the abuses common in private operation, discrimination between customers, for example, and we made sure our objectives were clear. But we did not attempt to fix the rates in the act and we did not know what the financial results of the policies would be. We took a chance. And TVA has proved us right. The rates established in the contracts between TVA and its distributors have covered all the costs of operation, including depreciation. They have earned a rate of return, in addition, 4 percent to TVA, an average of 8 percent to the distributors. TVA has proved that a power system can be operated as a public service and stay in the black.

Now I do not remember a single suggestion that we expected TVA in some mysterious fashion to set ideal rates which should be therefore established throughout the country. That is the notion you would get from the utility propagandists. We recognized that the cost of producing electricity varies. In the Northwest, for example, it can be produced more cheaply than in the Tennessee Valley. We had one firm conviction—that electricity should be made available to the people everywhere in this country at the lowest possible cost for each power system. And we felt TVA could help. We determined that every cost incurred by TVA and its distributors should be reported. We hoped that the Congress, the State regulatory commissions, private power companies themselves, and the public generally, would learn to compare the cost items in the several categories, to discover the reason for variables, to the end that electricity rates should be established on the basis of fact about costs, not in response to pressure or propaganda. In 1935 we amended the TVA Act to spell out exactly what we had in mind.

Let me read from the third paragraph of section 14 of the act:

"For the purpose of accumulating data useful to the Congress in the formulation of legislative policy in matters relating to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy \* \* \* and to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies, and to the public, the Board shall keep complete accounts of its costs of generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy and shall keep a complete account of the total cost of generating and transmission facilities constructed or otherwise acquired by the Corporation \* \* \* and a description of the major components of such costs according to such uniform system of accounting for public utilities as the Federal Power Commission has, and if it have none, then it is hereby empowered and directed to prescribe such uniform system of accounting, together with records of such other physical data and operating statistics of the Authority as may be helpful in determining the actual cost and value of services, and the practices, methods, facilities, equipment, appliances, and standards and sizes, types, location, and geographical and economic integration of plants and systems best suited to promote the public interest, efficiency, and the wider and more economical use of electric energy. Such data shall be reported to the Congress by the Board from time to time with appropriate analyses and recommendations, and so far as practicable, shall be made available to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies which may be concerned with the administration of legislation relating to the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy."

Perhaps we were naive. I do not know whether the reports so elaborately prepared

and presented annually by TVA and its distributors are used as we intended. I do know that electricity rates have come down and use has increased, while power system earnings have risen. When I see a chart showing in concentric circles the extent to which rates have been reduced in the area surrounding TVA, when I check upon the financial reports of the companies serving those areas, I see the yardstick at work, if not in the studious and technical way we expected it would be, surely in a highly effective manner. When I remember that the electrification of rural America through REA had its beginning in TVA's first organization of farm electric cooperatives, I see the yardstick at work. When I contemplate the vast quantities of power provided by private companies for vital installations of defense and at less than their normal charge for industrial loads, I know the yardstick has been used, however grudgingly.

From this long background I testify today. I hope this committee will resist the temptation to limit the flexibility the agency will require to offset, at least in part, some of the costs of private financing by the more precise timing of system additions which freedom from the appropriation process should make possible. I do not believe that every issue of bonds should require the same slow process of justification and approval, that an appropriation request requires. These are revenue bonds. They will rely for their security upon a continuation of efficient management. I am deeply opposed to the suggestion that the power of decision should rest in the Secretary of the Treasury, not in the Board of TVA. The Secretary of the Treasury is not responsible for the TVA power system. He has not sworn to promote the principles of the TVA Act. This goes to the heart of TVA. I hope the committee will reject the suggestion. I am against the adoption of a policy under which the Federal Government as owner would demand excessive withdrawals of cash. I am for the Kerr bill. I believe that its adoption would be in harmony with the public purposes of the TVA, and I believe it embodies better business principles than do the revisions proposed by the Bureau of the Budget. It gives to management authority sufficient to discharge its responsibilities.

If this committee approves and Congress adopts the Kerr bill we can continue to hold the Board of TVA accountable for results. If we accept the Budget revisions we will have our choice of culprits if this power system fails to lead the way in responsible management in the future. We can blame the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees of House or Senate, or the Treasury. We will dilute the very quality which has brought TVA world-wide esteem. We will be giving this public power system something less than the best. We will be inviting delay and confusion. We will be going backward, not ahead. We must advance. We are not through pioneering.

Just 2 years ago I made an extended visit to TVA. I visited laboratories and workshops, multipurpose dams and giant steam plants. I talked to workmen handling great earth-moving equipment, to engineers and draftsmen. I met with mayors and businessmen, with editors and farmers. I wanted to see for myself to illuminate the mass of documents I read about TVA every year. I visited projects in Mississippi, in Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Alabama.

My heart was stirred every time we visited the majestic structures which hold the waters back until the river's flow can be usefully employed for man. At each one I stopped to read the simple plaque of dedication. The names of the members of the Board are not honored there. No engineer, or architect, is listed for credit. Each one has the same inscription—just one line which

says: "Built for the people of the United States."

This is the people's power system, designed and built and operated for their benefit. TVA has earned our confidence and trust. TVA must be preserved.

## Twentieth Anniversary of Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANCIS E. DORN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 14, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will celebrate their 20th anniversary national convention at the Hotel Commodore in New York City.

The convention will see the report of progress made by this national veterans group in the fields of Americanism, Catholic action, leadership, veterans' affairs, and youth welfare. The high spot of the convention will be a gala testimonial banquet to honor the military vicar of the United States Armed Forces, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, at which time the Honorable James P. Mitchell, United States Secretary of Labor, will be the featured speaker.

In returning to New York City, the birthplace of the organization, Catholic War Veterans are stressing their 20 years of service "to God, to country, and to home."

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America was founded by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL. D., in 1935, "to promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home," the basis of its constitution.

In the course of its two decades of existence, the Catholic War Veterans has to its commendable credit the fact that it has spotted and fought totalitarian and brutalitarian philosophies of both the right and left and stood firm on the solid stand of freedom of the individual and personal independence of its citizenry under the law.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have received many commendations from agencies in government, in business, in welfare and hospital work, in rehabilitation, in child guidance, in patriotic, fraternal, veteran, and religious spheres. It is recognized by the Veterans' Administration in the handling of cases before it.

It has been commended by several United States Presidents, and a great many American statesmen.

Programs have included: summer camps for youngsters; informative material exposing fascism, nazism, and the cancerous core of Communist propaganda, broadcast and information bulletins on veteran benefits; support of youth groups, establishment of scholarship; fight for veterans' rights and spiritual comfort of our comrades; proper

burial for veterans and care for their widows and dependents; exposure of intolerance, bigotry, and disloyalty; promotion of activities which tend to strengthen the moral fiber of nation and its people, and build a greater spirit of faith and patriotism.

The current program of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is strictly positive. The Catholic War Veterans are protagonists of right, truth, and justice. Their whole philosophy is based on the recognition of man's dignity and rendering to God the things that are God's. They insist on the recognition of the moral basis, underlying all political, economic, and social themes.

They believe in action. "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." No program, no matter how magnificent, can be effective unless it is acted upon. They remember this—and act.

The two decades of Catholic War Veterans' existence have proved fruitful for our American freedom; and the future of America is safe when public-spirited, patriotic citizens who have fought for their Nation in war can continue to serve in peace.

The Catholic War Veterans is organized to serve. Size is not the measure of their service, their reputation, their loyalty, their faith, their spirit of fellowship. They take pride in their past, and are confident of their future.

## Central California Farmers and Conservationists Applaud Lostetter Report

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HENRY S. REUSS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have on July 27, 1955, called to the attention of this House a flagrant instance of secrecy in Government and attempted deception by a branch of the executive arm of Government. I refer to the Department of the Interior's suppression of an important conservation document which completely contradicts the views of Fish and Wildlife Director John Farley.

Mr. Farley tried to explain away my attack on his Department's laxity in enforcing the Federal regulation against duck baiting on the ground that California club owners were feeding "hungry ducks" when they shot migratory waterfowl within 200 yards of their guns.

The suppressed document prepared by Clinton H. Lostetter, a career biologist for the Fish and Wildlife Service, described the California duck baiting as "a disguised attempt to circumvent Federal regulations—a deceptive maneuver by the duck clubs through administrative channels to get legalized baiting."

In a few days the Department of the Interior will be issuing its 1955 regulations on duck baiting. Yet the Lostetter report which so thoroughly punctures Mr. Farley's alibi for the game hogs re-

mains locked up in the Department of the Interior.

I have received heartening news today from representatives of California rice farmers and conservationists that speaks highly of Clinton H. Lostetter and his efforts to help both the California farmer and our migratory waterfowl.

The telegram received by me today states:

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

In regard to California duck-baiting attack publicized in Fresno Bee, July 29, and San Francisco Chronicle, July 30, please be advised Clinton H. Lostetter, biologist, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, has done an outstanding job in this district and has succeeded in coordinating the complete cooperation of farmers, sportsmen, and waterfowl conservationists interested in the wintering grounds of the Pacific flyway of wild ducks and geese.

Mr. Lostetter expressed the opinion of the great majority of our members who also feel the opening of the waterfowl season prior to October 22 in central California will be extremely detrimental to agriculture and not in the best interests of good waterfowl conservation.

RICHARD DES JARDINS,  
President, Cal-O-Ro Rice Growers,  
South Dos Palos, Calif.; Cochairman,  
Fresno-Merced Counties  
Crop Depredation Committee.  
J. MARTIN WINTON,  
Waterfowl Representative, Sports-  
men's Council of Central California,  
and Cochairman Crop Depredation  
Committee, Fresno and  
Merced Counties.

It is time that the farmers, duck hunters, conservationists, and the American people find out if the Fish and Wildlife Service has become the tool of duck-baiting interests, and if Director Farley has been fooling the public by his claims that violations of the Federal regulation against duck baiting are justified because hungry ducks need to be fed.

If Mr. Farley's skirts are clean, he should be willing to release the Lostetter report. But if Mr. Farley has been deceiving the American public, the Government should release Mr. Farley.

## A Magnificent Legacy

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention the magnificent gift to be received by the Morristown National Historical Park under the will of Lloyd Wadell Smith. This park, incidentally, is located in my congressional district, and includes Washington's famous revolutionary headquarters in Morristown, and also the site of the Continental Army's encampment in nearby Jockey Hollow. The Jockey Hollow area, totaling some 1,000 acres, was given to the Government by Mr. Smith in 1933, thus



laying the groundwork for the establishment of the Morristown National Historical Park.

The late Lloyd Waddell Smith, one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, has left to the Morristown National Historical Park his unique collection of Americana. Included in this collection are hundreds of letters written by George Washington, his sword, and estate records. As an avid and discriminating collector, Mr. Smith amassed also a magnificent collection of Indian relics, largely found in New Jersey. Many manuscripts, books, and documents of the Civil War period also have been left to the national park.

In the light of this immensely valuable legacy, it is especially pleasing to me to know that these articles will be housed in a new wing to the national museum, located on the grounds of Washington's headquarters in Morristown. Sufficient funds for this purpose just recently have been made available to build this wing, which it is expected will be finished in 1956. At that time, therefore, one of our most interesting national parks will be able to display adequately the priceless and irreplaceable collection just left to the Nation by the late Lloyd Smith.

### The Low-Income Farmers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this Congress has failed to provide the money requested by the administration to help get the low-income farm program under way. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains speech after speech about the needs of family farms—especially the small farmer. But when it comes to action the low-income farmer is again the forgotten man.

The price-support and stabilization programs during the past year cost over a billion dollars. I want to make it clear that I am for price supports. The benefits went primarily to 2 million of the larger, more prosperous farmers, the ones best able to care for themselves.

There are 1½ million farmers with incomes of less than \$1,000 per year. They get little or no benefits from price supports. The administration announced a program for these low-income farmers and asked for a modest fund of \$3 million, plus \$30 million for loans. This Congress was in the process of denying any help for this program.

It was only after Senator AIKEN spoke out in protest at the last minute on July 26 and an amendment was submitted by Senator THYE that \$15 million with administrative expenses was provided for loans to the low-income farmers. The rest of the funds were denied. These low-income farmers can get additional help only by borrowing. Again they are the forgotten people.

Senator AIKEN said:

The President pointed out ways in which the low-income farmers could be helped, and he has asked for a very modest amount of money to be used in helping them. . . .

I had hoped that Congress would respond to the President's request. More than 1,000 counties, or about one-third of all the counties in the United States, are low-income counties; that is counties in which farmers who are hard up live. I regret very much that after the President had made this request of Congress, the House recently eliminated every dollar of appropriation, I believe, which would have enabled the several departments which would have cooperated to have helped improve the lot of the 1½ million low-income farmers.

I am more than disappointed, upon coming to the Senate today, to learn that the Senate Committee on Appropriations also has eliminated the funds which would have helped the President to carry out his program to improve the lot of the 1½ million low-income farmers.

President Eisenhower in sending the program to Congress said:

We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own wellbeing and for the good of our country and all our people.

This Congress will go home to find that all across this country, prominent leaders agreed that the rural development program for low-income farmers was sound. They will find disappointment and regret that Congress provided only one-half the loan funds requested and denied other modest requests of \$3 million to help low-income farm families.

### The McCook Family Papers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and to the country a significant recent addition to the Library of Congress. Through the generosity of Mrs. Katherine McCook Knox, of Washington, D. C., former daughter-in-law of the late Senator Philander C. Knox, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the Library of Congress has obtained the first installment of the McCook family papers. The active role in American history played by the descendants of George McCook, an early settler of Pittsburgh, is interestingly documented in this collection of letters, photographs, and clippings.

Many of the letters received by the Library of Congress relate to Gen. Anson G. McCook, father of the donor. General McCook, famous as one of the 15 "fighting McCooks" of the Civil War, was elected to Congress for three terms from 1877 to 1883. General McCook subsequently served for 10 years as Secretary to the United States Senate, having been chosen by both Democrats and Republicans.

The papers reflect General McCook's active life and include official and pri-

vate correspondence with Presidents Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt. President Harrison writes interestingly of his early reaction to presidential campaigning; President Hayes discusses the woes of the ex-President, and President Cleveland gives his personal hunting plans and preferences. Other friends prominent in United States public affairs are among the correspondents—Levi P. Morton, Thomas Nelson Page, William T. Sherman, Mark Hanna, and Admiral Robley D.—Fighting Bob—Evans.

The McCook family has been known for generations for its contribution to the legal profession and the ministry. Attorney George W. McCook was a law partner of Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War in President Lincoln's Cabinet; Attorney Daniel McCook, Jr., was a law partner of Gen. William T. Sherman and Gen. Thomas Ewing. The Reverend Henry C. McCook became a leading Presbyterian minister in Philadelphia. By his outside hobby in the field of zoology and biology, he has contributed substantially to the early research on the ant and spider species. Two other members of the McCook family have been commemorated as pioneers in the naming of McCook, Nebr., and McCook County, S. Dak.

The McCook family papers will be of interest to military and political historians as well as to students of American cultural history. The papers already in the Library's custody are available for study by permission of the donor, which may be requested through the Chief of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress.

It is hoped the outstanding contribution of Mrs. Knox will encourage other prominent families to make such valuable and interesting papers available to the Library of Congress and the general public.

### Fishing For Kids Only—West Branch, Mich., Leads the Way

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, up in the 10th Congressional District of Michigan the small community of West Branch, nestled in the hills of Ogemaw County, has set an example for the Nation in interesting young America in the sport of Izaak Walton.

The community has armed itself with a strong weapon against juvenile delinquency, against boy gangs, and against atheistic communism.

A few years ago a group of West Branch citizens, whose interest in youth went beyond the mere talking about the youth problem, set about to do something for the youngsters.

The result was "fishing for kids only," which in West Branch means that the

waters of the trout-abounding Weidman Creek, which winds its way through the town, is set aside for fishing solely by boys and girls under 16 years of age. And 24 property owners along the route of the creek have cooperated by hiding their "no trespassing" signs insofar as applying to the kids fishing from the creek banks of their land.

The idea of "fishing for kids only" which was pioneered in West Branch caught on quickly in Michigan and now about 40 communities are sponsoring similar projects.

Just how the proposal caught fire is described in the Kiwanis magazine as follows:

Two years ago, Kiwanian Mickey Duggan decided he wanted to do something to keep juvenile delinquency out of West Branch, Mich. Remembering how he liked fishing as a boy, Mickey thought it might be a good idea to give the local kids a private fishing preserve. West Branch gets its name from a trout stream that cuts through the heart of town, and Mickey's plan was to restrict fishing there to boys and girls 16 years old and under. He explained his idea around town, and everyone liked it. The State conservation department stocked the stream with trout for the kids.

Then West Branchers collected enough money from local sources to buy a 10½ acre plot of land bordering the stream. The kids went for the idea in a big way. Although thousands of trout were dumped into the stream at the beginning of the season, another load had to be planted.

Said one parent: "We used to worry about what our children were doing after school. But now, when we know they're fishing, our worries are over." The West Branch club, meanwhile, has been busy answering letters from educators, youth leaders, law officers, and park officials all over the country who want to learn more about the West Branch project.

So when a West Branch dad's favorite trout rod is missing he usually hikes for Weidman Creek and tries to locate Junior and the rod. A lot of pops and moms got the habit of trailing junior to the stream but in some places the going was pretty rugged for mom because much of the shoreline was brush covered and much more had been used as a dumping place so out of that came another benefit for the community. Some ten and a half acres of land along Weidman Creek were donated to the city by the West Branch Kiwanis Club, the Producers Refining Co., the Precision Manufacturing Co., and Mr. and Mrs. Paul Keeler.

Today this area is a beautiful spot known as Irons Memorial Park. There are signs on the larger trees, identifying them. There is an artesian well, fireplaces, picnic tables, log catwalks across the stream, and "old swimming hole."

Some civic-minded people donated money and others donated equipment, supplies, and labor to make the park possible. The park was another fruit of "Fishing for Kids Only."

But back to "fishing for kids only."

There has been another product of the program. The youngsters of the West Branch area have come to realize the value of clean streams and streams free of tin cans and garbage so they are doing their bit to keep their favorite fishing grounds free of litter.

The "fishing for kids" program is now sponsored by the retail merchants division of the West Branch Chamber of Commerce and this group has erected signs along the protected area of the stream proclaiming:

Mr. Fisherman, you are on your honor. This stream is reserved for boys and girls 16 years and under.

The Michigan United Conservation Club publication had this to say about it:

Some said the project would be a passing fancy—that there wouldn't be enough kids on the stream to make it worth while. A few days before the season opened the stream was stocked with legal size trout.

When the opener rolled around the youngsters were out on the stream by the hundreds. Being a little short on tackle, they were angling for trout with willow poles, casting rods and almost any type of fishing rig. Others rushed home and "borrowed" Dad's fly rod, net creel, and boots. Some 8-year-olds on the stream were almost hidden in their big boots.

The program has the approval of the Michigan Department of Conservation and Gerald E. Eddy, director of that department, says:

In many places, interested civic groups have set up and reserved stretches of natural public waters for kids. The State conservation department encourages this sort of natural use wherever it appears justified. Not unnatural ponds or stocked waters, but stretches of stream where Dame Nature is still chief stockholder. It's a project that service clubs, chambers of commerce, sportsmen's clubs, and other interested civic groups might find singularly profitable.

The project is being copied by other communities in Michigan and I hope my colleagues in the House will call it to the attention of some of our civic minded constituents because I am sure my friends in West Branch do not want to monopolize the idea. I am interested in young America. I want to do what I can to interest him in baseball and other competitive sports and in fishing and in conservation and in God's great out-of-doors. If we can direct the attention of our youth along these lines we will have need for less national concern about some of the youth problems that have been discussed on this floor during this session of Congress.

I invite my colleagues to come to the Tenth District of Michigan after Congress adjourns and enjoy our out-of-doors and our recreational areas. We have beautiful streams abounding in trout, our fresh-water lakes with game fish awaiting your lure, and beautiful Lake Huron with its perch and other fish.

#### Bernard M. Baruch's 85th Birthday

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on August 19 one of America's great elder statesmen of all times, Mr. Bernard M.

Baruch, will celebrate his 85th birthday. This is a milestone which few among us are destined to reach. In this respect Mr. Baruch is one of the few who was blessed by the Almighty, and he has utilized these bountiful years for a most constructive life and the welfare of humanity.

Bernard M. Baruch was born on August 19, 1870. As he reaches the age of fourscore and five, the people of this country know him as a stalwart American, a philosopher-statesman, a philanthropist, and a master mobilizer of our national strength. We know him also as an adviser and personal confidante of the last seven Presidents, both Democrat and Republican, and as the man who by his wisdom and patriotic deeds has influenced American life and American leaders for the past half century.

Of him, Dwight D. Eisenhower said in August 1952:

I was one of those who for the past quarter century has had the privilege of sitting at his [Baruch's] feet and listening to his words of wisdom, words that are still mighty. Beyond this, he is one of those who has shown to us that if a man forgets all else except service to country, then indeed the country will remember him with respect and affection.

The people of America, indeed, think of Bernard M. Baruch today with respect and affection and will always so regard him. He had endeared himself in the hearts of our people nearly four decades ago when he played such a major role in mobilizing our country's resources during World War I, and in subsequent loyal and unselfish deeds and services to our Nation in times of peace or in times of peril. He is one of the great architects of our Nation's strength who helped defend our freedom and preserve our national security.

Baruch was among the first to recognize and to warn against the danger of totalitarian aggression to the United States and the other democratic nations of the world. He has repeatedly made this warning, which contains a good deal of commonsense philosophy:

There is only one way to protect yourself from a possible aggressor. Be strong. Be so strong he cannot dare attack you without fear of self-destruction. In that way you achieve peace, and only in that way. There are certain people who only understand strength. They sneer at weakness, no matter how noble the aim of the seeker after peace.

"Peace through strength" was written about Mr. Baruch by Morris V. Rosenbloom. This is an apt and timely title.

On the occasion of Mr. Baruch's 85th birthday, I take this opportunity to extend to him my heartfelt greetings and sincere wishes. I consider it a great honor to pay public tribute to him as one who has made such a marked imprint on American life and statesmanship. His is the guiding hand of a great master, the tireless devotion of a great patriot, and the boundless enthusiasm of a great humanitarian.

May he continue to be with us for many more years to come. May he live to see the fulfillment of his noble ideals of a mankind truly at peace and enjoying the fruits of human freedom.



**Let's Look at the Record—A Report to the People of the Fourth District of Wisconsin on the 1st Session of the 84th Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of each session of Congress, I report to the people of my district on my votes and actions as their Representative in our National Legislature.

The report which follows contains a summary of the major issues which confronted the Congress during the present session, and indicates how these issues were resolved. It also reviews my position and votes on key legislative bills.

I have been submitting these annual reports because I believe that the voters have a right to know what their representatives did, and how they stood on important questions. Such information is necessary to enable the people to properly evaluate the work of their elected officials.

In the words of Al Smith, "Let's look at the record"—the record of the 84th Congress, and the record of the Representative from the Fourth District of Wisconsin.

**THE 84TH CONGRESS**

The legislative record of the 1st session of the 84th Congress was characterized by three general features. We should bear them in mind as we proceed to analyze the actions of our representatives in Washington.

In the first place, the Democrat-controlled 84th Congress showed more concern for the interests of the people as a whole than did the preceding one. The farmer, the worker, the small-business man—the Mr. Average Taxpayer—will generally benefit from the bills considered during the first session. This was in sharp contrast with the attention shown to select groups by the 83d Congress.

Secondly, the Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress gave the President full cooperation on issues affecting national security and the overall national interest. In fact, those features of the President's program which were intended to benefit the common good received more support from the Democrats than from the President's own party.

Finally, legislative progress achieved during the first session was moderate, when measured in terms of bills approved by both Houses and enacted into law. Nevertheless, considerable amount of work was exerted in laying the groundwork for the second session which will begin next January. Final action will be taken during the next session on a number of bills which were drafted, studied, and approved either by the House or by the Senate this year.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY**

In this realm, the 84th Congress approved an extension of the Selective Service System, continued the draft of doctors for 2 years, reorganized the military reserve system, took steps to provide for emergency appointments to fill congressional vacancies caused by disaster, and sharply increased the funds for the Air Force.

Considerable controversy raged on this last issue. Two years ago, over the strong opposition of the Democrats who were then in the minority, President Eisenhower cut Air Force funds by \$5 billion, thereby delaying the buildup of our airpower. When the Soviets demonstrated earlier this year that their air strength may exceed ours, Congress decided to take matters into its own hands.

Key administration leaders and military authorities were promptly summoned to a secret meeting on Capitol Hill. After the meeting was over, Democratic congressional leaders took immediate steps to speed up our jet production by 35 percent. Even with this development, we are two years behind, having lost that precious time because of the 1953 cuts.

On the question of the Reserve reorganization bill, the President wanted a law which would compel all veterans, discharged since the Korean war, to participate in active Reserve training. The Congress, however, decided to exempt present and former servicemen from compulsory training. Under the new law, Reserve training will be mandatory only for those boys who will enter on active duty in the future. Unfortunately, this provision is expected to delay the attainment of the administration's goal of an active Reserve of 2.9 million men.

**INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

In the field of foreign affairs, Congress extended our Trade Agreements Program for 3 years, and took steps to simplify our obsolete and burdensome customs procedures which act as a deterrent to international trade. Further, the President was given authority to aid in the defense of Formosa against a direct Communist attack, and received adequate funds to continue our Mutual Security Program of military and economic cooperation with our allies. Congress also reiterated its opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and repeated its pledge that the United States will not support any colonial or imperialistic policies of other nations.

In general, cognizant of its role under our Constitution, Congress did not attempt to make foreign policy decisions for the President. There was evidence, however, of a growing measure of concern about recent developments in the field of foreign relations. While everyone welcomed the apparent relaxation of world tensions, some people wondered if the Communists were not just stalling for time.

The anxiety to attain peace has already resulted in concessions to the Communists in Korea, in Indochina, and in

the Formosa Strait. More recently, the administration began to proclaim the virtues of "coexistence"—that very concept which the GOP condemned so heartily only a couple of years ago. It further appeared that the administration may be willing—in fact if not in word—to accept the status quo with respect to Soviet control of the once-free nations, and to make further concessions to the Reds. While we all realize that the road to world peace is not easy, the question still remains, Will that goal be achieved by walking backward?

**GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION**

While the 84th Congress did little to streamline the cumbersome machinery of the executive branch, it did initiate some important improvements within its own organization. In an effort to correct the abuses perpetrated during recent years, Congress took steps to establish a code of fair practices for congressional investigating committees. Further, much work went into the preparation of bills which will strengthen our laws governing Federal elections, and which are intended to curtail corrupt practices.

As far as the executive branch was concerned, the work of the second Hoover Commission continued without interruption. The many volumes of recommendations made by the Commission were assigned to different congressional committees for study, and steps will probably be taken to implement them during the next session.

The first session witnessed a comprehensive revision of Federal salaries, beginning with post office workers, classified employees, and reaching into the levels of higher administration officials, Members of Congress, and Federal judges. Steps were also taken to bring the retirement benefits of Government workers to a more realistic level by increasing them between 8 and 12 percent.

**NATIONAL ECONOMY**

In the realm of national economy, the record of the first session is rather substantial. Congress plugged up the loopholes in the 1954 GOP tax law, through which the Government was losing over \$1 billion in revenues to corporations; increased the minimum wage to \$1 per hour; approved an expanded program of Federal aid to airport construction; extended the Renegotiation Act to eliminate excess profits on Government contracts; and increased the penalties for violations of the antimonopoly laws.

There were two major instances, however, in which Congress failed to reach a decision. The first dealt with taxes; the second, with the highway program.

At the beginning of the session, the Democratic leadership in the House proposed a moderate income-tax reduction for the average taxpayer, to equalize tax relief granted to select groups under the 1954 GOP law. The bill passed the House, but failed in the Senate. There is every indication, however, that this legislation will be brought up again when the second session begins, probably with better results.

The controversial highway program legislation met similar fate. While everyone agreed that our highway system is in need of extensive improvements, a controversy arose on the question of financing the program. The administration wanted to pay for the improvements by bond issues, thereby increasing the national debt. The Democrats proposed a pay-as-you-go program, financed out of increased taxes on highway users. Both proposals were defeated in the House during the closing days of the session.

#### VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Veterans and servicemen will benefit from a number of bills approved by the 84th Congress to date. Military salaries were increased, and the House approved a comprehensive revision of survivors' benefits. Further, those in the service as of January 31, 1955, were permitted to go on building up GI schooling benefits, and VA farm and direct loan programs were extended for 2 years.

In addition, Congress approved a law giving disabled veterans until October 1956 to apply for the purchase of special automobiles, and extended this privilege to the veterans of the Korean conflict.

Of particular interest to the veterans in Milwaukee is a bill which I introduced in the 83d and the 84th Congresses providing for the construction of a new VA hospital at Wood, Wis. I am pleased to report that considerable progress has been made during the past year on this project. Our present hospital at Wood has been scheduled for early replacement by a new structure.

#### AGRICULTURE

The American farmer has not been faring well under the present administration, as the farm income continued to drop for the third year in a row. In the meantime, the profits of food processors—and the cost of farm products to city consumers—have been steadily rising.

In an effort to help the farmers, the 84th Congress approved bills modernizing the REA loan allocation system, extending emergency loans to farmers suffering from declining prices, lowering the interest rate on disaster loans, and providing special assistance to low-income farmers. In addition, steps were taken to curb commodity speculation, and to curtail market manipulations in certain agricultural products.

The central issue of rigid farm price supports versus flexible supports continued unresolved, even though efforts were made in the House to replace the sliding-scale system put into operation by the administration.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Social welfare legislation received a considerable amount of attention from the 84th Congress, but relatively few bills in this field managed to clear both Houses before the end of the first session. Final action will be taken on these

measures when Congress reconvenes in January.

The Social Security Act amendments of 1955 were in this category. The House voted to extend social-security coverage to dentists, lawyers, and other self-employed professional groups; to provide a system of disability insurance; to reduce the retirement age for women to 62; and to continue monthly benefits to disabled children after they reach age 18. I have advocated the major improvements approved by the House for the past 3 years, and included them in my bills, H. R. 1635 and H. R. 5057.

Hearings on this legislation were held in the Senate, but final action was delayed until next session.

Congress further provided funds for the FHA program of insuring home loans, made Government surplus materials available to educational and civil-defense institutions, tightened the prohibition on the use of mails to transport obscene literature, and enacted a moderate housing program. However, legislation providing Federal aid to schools was bottled up throughout the session, and may be revived when the Congress reconvenes.

#### Voting record, 84th Cong., 1st session

Stand	Issue	Status
<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY</b>		
Voted for.....	Extension of the Selective Service System.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Reorganization and strengthening of our military Reserves.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Registration of persons connected with foreign espionage.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Stepped up production of jet bombers and fighter planes.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Special funds to prevent 22,000-man cut in United States Marine Corps.....	Became law.
<b>INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS</b>		
Voted for.....	The mutual-security program to strengthen free world defenses.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Resolution calling for United States aid to defense of Formosa.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Resolution opposing admission of Red China into the U. N.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements program.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Simplification of our customs regulations and procedures.....	Passed House.
Favored.....	Aid to firms and workers harmed by foreign competition.....	Pending.
Favored.....	Revision of the Refugee Relief Act.....	Pending.
<b>GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION</b>		
Voted for.....	Government Reorganization Act of 1955.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Salary revisions for Federal employees, judges, and officials.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.....	Pending.
Voted for.....	Code of fair practices for congressional committees.....	Approved.
Favored.....	Increased penalties for corrupt practices in Federal elections.....	Pending.
Voted for.....	Improvements in the Federal employees retirement system.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Foreign Service reorganization and improvements.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Aids to absentee voting for GI's and Government workers.....	Became law.
Favored.....	Home rule for the District of Columbia.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Railroad Retirement System improvements.....	Became law.
<b>NATIONAL ECONOMY</b>		
Voted for.....	Income tax reduction for the average taxpayer.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Plugging up of loopholes in the 1954 GOP tax law.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Increase in minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1 per hour.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Increased penalties for violation of antimonopoly laws.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	The highway program legislation.....	Passed Senate.
Voted against.....	Exemption of natural-gas producers from Federal regulation.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Continued renegotiation of Government contracts to eliminate excess profits on Government procurement.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Bill to provide United States currency with inscription "In God We Trust.".....	Became law.
<b>VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN</b>		
Voted for.....	Continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Incentive pay increases and allowances for the Armed Forces.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Revision and improvement of survivors' benefits.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Extension of VA farm and direct loan programs.....	Became law.
Proposed.....	New VA hospital for Wood, Wis.....	Pending.
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
Voted for.....	Modernized REA loan allocation system.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Relief for farmers for losses from economic disasters.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Greater control over commodity speculation and manipulations.....	Became law.
Opposed.....	Multibillion upper Colorado River project with Echo Park Dam.....	Passed Senate.
<b>SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE</b>		
Voted for.....	1955 amendments to the Social Security Act.....	Passed House.
Favored.....	Federal aid to States for construction of needed new schools.....	Pending.
Voted for.....	Assistance to States for the Salk polio vaccine program.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Increased authority for the FHA to insure home mortgages.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Surplus Government material for schools and civil defense.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Restoration of penalties for narcotics violations omitted from the 1954 GOP tax law.....	Became law.
Voted for.....	Prohibition on use of mails to transport obscene literature.....	Became law.
Voted against.....	The Chicago "water steal" from Lake Michigan.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Aid for mental health research.....	Passed House.
Voted for.....	Aid to States for airport construction.....	Became law.

Rollcall record	Total rollcalls	Paired	Not voting	Absent on roll and quorum calls <sup>1</sup>
1st session.....	147	1	1	2

<sup>1</sup> Absence on quorum calls does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.



## The Small Business Administration

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to urge that the Small Business Administration be continued for another 2 years. At the end of this period I believe Congress will decide that a permanent independent agency with increased authority is both necessary and desirable to assure the continued welfare of small business concerns in our economy. There is no doubt that many benefits have been derived from the financial, procurement, and technical assistance programs established under the Small Business Administration. Certainly there is no agency in Government which can approach the centralized function of assistance to small business that is presently performed by this agency.

All of us are aware of the increased economic power occasioned by the merger movement, the difficulty smaller manufacturers have in securing a fair share of the procurement dollar, the trials all types of small business have in acquiring long-term credit and of the continued need for managerial and technical assistance and advice. The Small Business Administration has made a good beginning in its efforts to correct and solve some of these difficulties perennially encountered by small business.

I am sure that my colleagues are familiar with what has been done by the Small Business Administration in its several programs.

It may be that some of you feel as I do that the results to date are not as completely satisfactory as we want them. Based on my close observations of the work of the Small Business Administration as a member of the House Small Business Committee, I can see certain areas in which improvement is necessary.

Although not a member of Subcommittee No. 2, I sat through the long hearings held by this committee because of my great interest in the problems presented and my desire to provide constructive solutions for them.

If there is one conclusion which may be reached as a result of those hearings—a conclusion of unanimous agreement—it is the absolute necessity of guarding the independence of the Small Business Administration.

Experience has taught us that an administrator of an independent small-business agency not only listens intently and with great interest to the findings and conclusions of the committees of the Congress but in addition acts upon congressional recommendations as well as the intent of the Congress as provided in the law.

Therefore, I should like to devote my remarks to certain aspects of small business and Government which are not generally discussed. I want to emphasize why an independent agency devoted ex-

clusively to service to small firms is both necessary and desirable.

The various duties and responsibilities, and the efficiency of the administration of the agency, can from time to time be examined and remedial action taken if necessary. As an adjunct to a regular department, the officials of a small-business office would listen politely to the Congress and then, as they should do, follow the direction of the department head.

It is true that virtually every large governmental agency has provided certain types of services to business concerns, including small business. The Department of Commerce, for example, has been interested primarily in the general problems of business as a whole. Collaterally, small-business problems are considered incidentally and as one part of the overall business picture. They are not the type of problems which are of the most immediate concern to the small firm, particularly in a period of economic expansion and rapid changes in products and processes. Small firms must be able to adjust quickly to new or improved methods or they fall by the wayside.

The type of assistance needed is not what an old-line agency, concerned always in the past with long-range help, is equipped to give. The entrenched procedures, fixed channels, and tier upon tier of reviewing authorities of the old-line agency frustrate efforts to give quick help in solving urgent problems.

The Department of Commerce itself seemingly recognized these facts when it transferred its own small-business unit from the Department proper to the National Production Authority soon after creation of that emergency agency and later to the successor agency, the Business and Defense Services Administration.

The experiences of World War II, as well as those of the present period, have shown clearly that small business does not receive effective help when responsibility for assisting it is assigned to one unit of a large agency that has many offices and many functions. When this is done, the small-business function of the agency is swallowed up among its many other duties.

It has often been stated that incorporation of a small-business program within a large agency would permit for effective representation. It is not true, however, that greater representation would result from such a move. Obviously, the Secretary of a Department would not personally guide the Department's small-business program. He would delegate this responsibility to another official, possibly an Assistant Secretary or an Under Secretary, but more likely to an office or division chief, as was the case in the past. Instead of having the head of an independent agency serving as its representative, small business then would be represented by an official of lesser rank who could not act on important matters without prior approval of superiors who could not approach the heads of other agencies on an equal footing and who could not report on small-business problems

directly to the President and the Congress.

What small business needs is a separate, independent agency that can serve as a focal point of assistance to it, and that can act quickly and authoritatively in its behalf when the need arises. During the first years of World War II, for example, most military contracts were going to large producers. Small firms were being denied the opportunity to participate fully in the production of war materials. In response to the protests of small-business men, the Smaller War Plants Corporation was set up, as a part of the War Production Board, to help small firms obtain contracts. This Corporation was successful in getting a larger percentage of contracts for small business.

As in World War II, during the early months of the Korean war, small firms were being treated unfairly in the awarding of defense orders and in other phases of the defense program. Again, their protests led to the creation of an independent agency—Small Defense Plants Administration—which had no other function than to help small firms to overcome mobilization problems. Once again, a separate, independent agency proved to be what small business needed.

On the basis of past experience, it seems very unlikely that centralization of Government assistance to small business in the Department of Commerce would be to the advantage of small firms. In January 1946, for example, many of the functions of Smaller War Plants Corporation—functions which had proved of great help to small business—were transferred to the Department of Commerce and located there in a new and well-staffed unit, the Office of Small Business. A little over 2 years later, the small-business function had largely disappeared among the many other functions of the Department. The Office of Small Business had been reduced to a minor unit of a large bureau and was staffed by only a handful of employees.

Further, the Department, in its previous opportunity to perform small-business functions, did not achieve success with them. In fact, its failure to perform the functions successfully, as attested to by hundreds of small-business men appearing before congressional committees, was a major reason for the creation of the Small Business Administration and the assignment to it of broad small-business responsibilities.

Virtually the same analysis may be made of the military services and the role of small business within those services. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all have small-business specialists, who are supposed to look after the interests of small business in awards of contracts. The fact is that the small-business specialists in the armed services are not as effective in behalf of small firms as an independent agency like the Small Business Administration.

One basic reason that small-business specialists in the armed services cannot do a fully effective job in behalf of small firms is that, after all, they are employed by the military branches and they must accept the policies and practices of the armed services. They are not in a posi-

tion to exercise independence of action. They cannot formulate policies or even exert an appreciable influence on their formulation.

The Small Business Administration, on the other hand, is completely independent of other agencies and is devoted solely to the purpose of assisting small business with the special problems it encounters. It represents the interest of small business on various policymaking interagency committees, advises other agencies on questions affecting small firms, and serves as a "watchdog" in their behalf with respect to policies and activities of other Federal agencies.

Another basic reason why small-business specialists in the armed services cannot serve the interests of small firms effectively is the ingrained psychology in contracting offices which precludes adequate consideration for the small would-be Government contractors. Because so much of military purchasing is on a large scale, and so many items bought are products of such size that they can be made only by very large concerns—planes, tanks, trucks, big guns, et cetera—there is an inevitable tendency toward turning to the larger businesses for almost every kind of item. More accustomed to dealing with such concerns, contracting officers have too often adopted the attitude that it is easier to buy nearly everything from large firms. It is extremely difficult for small-business specialists in the armed services to overcome such habits of thinking on the part of contracting officers and higher officials.

Small Business Administration representatives in the procurement centers, on the other hand, are not prevented by the circumstances of their employment from making all possible efforts to obtain contracts for small firms. Their allegiance is to the Small Business Administration and the interests of small business, not to officials of the armed services. It is their job to see to it that small firms have an opportunity to obtain contracts for any kind of purchase which they are capable of supplying. The difference in point of view matters a great deal.

Small-business men bring a great variety of problems to the Small Business Administration for help, usually involving dealings with other agencies. In numerous instances they have stated that they have tried repeatedly to get assistance from other agencies involved without success, and only by coming to the Small Business Administration could they get the help they needed.

Without an independent champion in the Government, small business would have no central agency to look to for assistance. Efforts in behalf of small firms would be widely diffused throughout a number of Federal agencies. The inevitable consequences, as in times past, would be confusion, loss of time, piecemeal efforts to assist small business, and inadequate and belated help.

This has been incontrovertibly demonstrated by experience. Efforts to deal with the problems of small firms through offices of small business or small business specialists in the regular departments of Government have been tried, and have failed.

The testimony of small-business men who have looked to the Small Business Administration for help and who have obtained it, truly indicates that an independent agency can cut through the confusion of scattered, piecemeal, inadequate efforts to assist small firms and make it possible for them to obtain quick and effective help.

Instead of an inefficient diffusion of efforts—always too little and usually too late—the Small Business Administration can provide a direct, central means of giving efficient assistance and representation to small business. Only through an independent agency can small business ever achieve proper recognition of its problems, with appropriate programs leading to a solution of these problems.

### Where Does the United States Stand With Respect to Soviet Russia in the Race for Aerial Supremacy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention, and to the attention of the Congress, a matter which has lately given me increasing concern. It is a matter which ties very directly to the question asked so many times this past month—where do we in the United States stand with respect to Soviet Russia in the race for aerial supremacy?

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the vast disproportion that has developed between the large expenditures for building new aircraft and the relatively much smaller expenditures for obtaining the basic research knowledge which, in the last analysis, determines their quality and their utility. The lumping together of research expenditures with the many times larger sums for the construction of the first models of new engines, airplanes, and guided missiles serves to conceal the relatively small effort the United States is concentrating upon research.

What we need is a better balance between our research effort and our development and production of new models of aircraft and missiles. Restoration of a realistic balance between the two—research on the one hand and development and production on the other—need not be expensive. In fact, I am convinced that such action can result in the saving for the American taxpayers of untold millions of dollars. It can save many lives among our test pilots and our youth who fly the planes in service.

More important still, achievement of balance between research and production of new aircraft and missiles can assure that the United States maintains its position of leadership in the world of aeronautics.

Let me give you a single illustration of the tragic consequences of the lack of knowledge, the lack of sufficient infor-

mation coming from research. On a warm, sunny day in California last fall, one of our newest—and most promising—fighter aircraft prototypes took off on a test flight. This particular flight was the last of a series being made to demonstrate that the new airplane was able to perform satisfactorily the severe maneuvers which would be required of it in service use.

The pilot, one of the best in the business, climbed to a preselected altitude at which he began to perform the specified maneuver. Something went wrong: The airplane disintegrated in midair; the pilot was killed.

At first, no one knew what had caused this tragedy. But the most intensive studies of the wreckage and other available evidence finally revealed the cause. In the words of the chief engineer of the company which had designed and built the plane, the pilot "encountered some hitherto unsuspected mysteries of supersonic flight—an unexplainable phenomenon—a maneuver never before experienced under those conditions."

This strange maneuver, I am told, was a sudden and uncontrollable turn to the right. Instead of keeping its sleek nose pointed into the supersonic wind of 100 times hurricane strength, the airplane suddenly turned and went into a violent skid. The result was that the terrific wind forces existing at supersonic speed battered the sturdy aircraft structure until it broke into pieces.

I have been relieved to learn that, in this case, a remedy was soon found. But I am disturbed when I reflect that, in cases like this, months of precious time, and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of engineering and production effort are being committed to projects where the line between success and failure is so narrow.

Even when the trouble can be soon corrected, the disorganization of the production line, and the great amount of additional engineering effort required, cost many millions of dollars. What is far more important, if the trouble cannot be corrected, the many years of effort that have gone into the development of the airplane or the missile are the same as thrown away.

We cannot win a technical race with Russia that way. And, whether we like it or not, the Soviet Russians have engaged in a race with us—to become first in the air. Assuming that we are still ahead in that race, I can find no reason to believe that we will long maintain the lead we now have, if we adopt an attitude of complacency or fail to make full use of our technical talents.

The instance of trouble with a new type aircraft that I mentioned is not an isolated case. During these past few critical years there have been other instances of airplanes which had to be grounded as a result of unknown faults that caused them to break apart in the air.

Why does this sort of thing happen? I am not an engineer or a scientist, and I do not pretend to know all the answers. But I will say this: I have looked into these accidents sufficiently to know that what is happening is that in our haste to bring about great improvement in



the performance capabilities of our airplanes, we are forcing our aircraft companies to design for production on the basis of insufficient basic aeronautical knowledge.

In the decades before World War II, the United States was the acknowledged world leader in aeronautics. This was due to the research effort carried on during those years. At the beginning of that war, we had a backlog of basic aeronautical information which could be exploited readily by use in the design of new and improved aircraft.

But since the war, due to the supersonic possibilities implicit in the turbojet and rocket engine, our designers have had to accelerate their work to the point where the lead time between our aircraft research and our aircraft design and prototype production has been cut virtually to zero.

I am informed that our aircraft research people were just beginning to understand the nature of some of the problems that caused the tragic accident last fall at the very time the accident occurred. What I am saying is that, somehow, we must assure that our research people define these new mysterious problems and come up with the solutions, before new designs get to the flight stage, not after the airplanes begin breaking up in midair. And they should be able to do this in ample time for the designers to study and digest the research data before the design starts.

Our research effort has not kept pace. It is too thin today to provide the required lead time before design, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that this is a situation which has been worsening during the past few years.

In the postwar period between 1946 and 1953 appropriations for all military aircraft procurement—including airplanes and missiles—increased from \$415 million to \$15 billion—an increase of 3,500 percent.

During this same period, the appropriations for salaries and expenses of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, our principal aeronautical research agency, went up from \$24 million to \$48.6 million—an increase of 100 percent.

In 1946, we were spending about 6 percent of the procurement appropriation to insure the technical quality of our aircraft, compared to only three-tenths of 1 percent for such insurance in 1953. Today the picture remains much the same as in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all agreed as to the necessity of spending the many billions of dollars required to construct and operate for peace great fleets of airplanes and missiles. But when we spend those billions, we must insist that they provide superiority in the air, in quality as well as in quantity.

Our airplanes and our missiles must be able not only to meet their performance guaranties in the skilled hands of the expert company pilots. They must be able to operate, at performance guaranty levels, under the rigorous demands of military service.

The basic research required to provide the answers which will enable us to build supersonic aircraft that will be

controllable, reliable and structurally sound—as well as sleek and fast—is an essential element in our airpower picture. We cannot afford to neglect it.

### United States Circuit Court of Appeals Decision Nullifies the Legislative Intent of the Housing Act of 1954

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to participate in congressional investigations and observe the administration of various of the laws enacted by Congress to stabilize our economy, and promote the public welfare.

Some shocking circumstances and abuses have developed through practices adopted purportedly by authority of congressional acts.

One flagrant example is in the Home Loan Bank System. More than 9 years ago, the then Home Loan Bank Commissioner seized a member institution, the Long Beach Federal Savings Association, and to this day the Government agency has failed to fully account for the seized assets. A meritorious trial of the issues has been denied on jurisdictional technicalities, a complete failure of due process.

Congress never intended to set up a bureaucratic sanctuary for arbitrary and capricious confiscation of peoples' savings, without trial, notice, hearing, or right of recovery.

The United States circuit court of appeals at San Francisco held the simplest amendment would correct this evil. Congress adopted in the Housing Act of 1954, far-reaching provisions, giving the courts jurisdiction to hear the complaints of aggrieved citizens.

The Senate 1954 housing bill, as originally adopted prior to conference, contained the restrictive language, as follows:

Nothing in this subsection relating to jurisdiction, venue, service of process or suitability of the Board shall be applicable to any pending court action, or suit, or to any action or suit involving the subject matter, or part thereof, of such pending action or suit.

The House considered and rejected restrictive language. The Senate and House conferees considered and rejected restrictive language, and both Houses reenacted the 1954 Housing Act without such restriction, and granted to the courts jurisdiction of the subject matter of new and old controversies alike.

In fact, the written documents considered by both Houses referred to the specific Long Beach Federal controversy—the subject of the United States circuit court opinion.

In spite of the legislative history and plain language of the 1954 Housing Act, the United States circuit court of ap-

peals has just held, in July 1955, that such Housing Act does not apply to pending controversies, and, further, that the subject matter of new and old controversies is not submitted to the courts.

Thus, there has developed a conflict between the enactments of Congress and the enactments of the United States circuit court of appeals. The United States circuit court of appeals has usurped the functions of Congress; instead of interpreting the intent of Congress, its interpretation has in effect passed laws Congress rejected and rejected laws Congress passed.

Such United States circuit courts are a creation of Congress—an experiment to relieve the burden on the United States Supreme Court, the only constitutional appellate court.

Congress has heretofore found it necessary to withdraw from the United States circuit court of appeals the power to hold acts of Congress unconstitutional by injunction.

I submit that in the light of the circumstances related here, our congressional experiment in creating United States circuit courts of appeal has demonstrated a grave weakness.

The decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in this case is an example of complete disregard of the congressional intent based on the legislative history of the Housing Act of 1954, as well as the letter of the law.

Should not Congress correct this abuse by further restricting the power of United States circuit courts of appeal from nullifying or rendering ineffectual congressional enactments?

#### Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was not on the floor the other day when Members were extending their congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar on the completion of their 20th year of service to Members of the House and Senate.

As soon as I came here in 1943 I started using the radio facilities of the joint Senate and House recording facility and, of course, I immediately got to know Mr. and Mrs. Coar. They are the kind of people who so identify themselves with an institution that they virtually become the institution.

I take particular pride in the fact that Mr. Coar had his origin in my own State. That, of course, adds to the very warm feeling that I have for him. But I am very grateful to both Mr. and Mrs. Coar for all the kindness and courtesy which they have shown to me and it is a great pleasure and satisfaction for me to be able to spread these sentiments on the RECORD.

I can testify that as far as I am concerned the recording facility is indis-

pensable. At least every fortnight of every session since January 1943, I have projected myself onto its disks and, more recently, tapes. In all that period I have never known of a mistake or slip-up on their part. I wish Mr. and Mrs. Coar another score of years. And then another. I would not wish to be here without them.

### Give a Green Light to Highway Legislation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the past year 36,000 Americans, many of them children, were killed in traffic accidents. The death toll in traffic accidents average 100 a day, or 3,000 a month. In addition, about a million Americans were injured in traffic mishaps, some of them being crippled for life. Ten to twenty percent of these accidents never would have happened, according to traffic experts, had the Nation possessed adequate highways—the kind of better, wider, and safer highways proposed by President Eisenhower in his expanded highway program.

Much of the credit for alerting the Nation to the need for better and safer highways belongs to the Hearst press. The Hearst press, with its many newspapers and millions of readers, several years ago embarked on an editorial crusade to awaken the country to the enormous waste of life, limb, and money that our deficient highway system is costing the Nation. Day after day, week after week, and month after month the Hearst press hammered away editorially at the need for more and better roads. The Hearst press, in so doing, rendered a great service to the Nation.

Despite the public's demand for more and better highways, Congress has failed to enact a highway bill during the present session of Congress. This failure was due to politics.

President Eisenhower had proposed financing the greatly expanded highway program by a bond issue to be paid off from present and anticipated future receipts from the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax.

The Democrats, as a counterproposal to President Eisenhower's bonding plan, proposed a pay-as-you-go highway financing plan with the imposition of heavy new taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, truck tires, and camelback.

The issue involving the two plans, the Eisenhower one of bond financing and the Democrats' plan of increasing taxes on highway users to pay for highways as these were built came to a vote in the House of Representatives last Wednesday.

When the Eisenhower bonding plan was voted upon, of 221 Democrats present only 5 voted for the President's bonding plan and 216 voted against it. The Democrats by a margin of 23 to 1 re-

jected President Eisenhower's bonding plan.

Then the Democrats' own taxing plan came to a vote. Of 223 Democrats present, only 98 voted for their own plan. The Democrats voted down their own taxing plan after having rejected the Eisenhower bonding plan.

This made it obvious that a majority of the Democrats wanted no highway bill at all. Apparently they preferred no highway program to one for which President Eisenhower would get credit.

If the people want a highway bill, and I feel sure most people do, they must contact their Congressmen and let their Congressmen know their wishes.

In my opinion, the only way to assure obtaining a highway bill within the next 2 years is to insist on a special session of Congress to enact a highway bill. If this week's rejection of a highway program by Congress is allowed to stand, it will be next January before the first steps can be taken toward launching anew procedures to get a highway program started. Congress, then, as usual, will dilly-dally and procrastinate. It will be April or May before any bills for a highway program reach the House or Senate floors. By that time the 1956 presidential and congressional election campaigns will be in full swing. Because of this the proposed highway legislation will become more deeply involved in politics than it now is and constructive action will be unlikely.

The following editorial has appeared in Hearst newspapers from coast to coast, pointing up the urgent need for better and safer roads and rightly, I think, demands that Congress stay in session until it gets a highway bill. If Congress does not stay in session now to get a highway bill then the next demand from the people should be that Congress come back in a special session and enact the highway bill it should have enacted before it went home on vacation.

The editorial, which appeared in Hearst newspapers from coast to coast, follows:

#### WHY IS A CONGRESSMAN?

If you don't want to think about the traffic jams you'll be in today as you and your family try to take a ride in the country, you might think about Congressmen.

As you notice the ambulances and wreckers and State police cars heading toward the latest highway disaster, notice also what went on last week in Washington.

Congressmen of both parties, stampeded by lobbyists representing industries that make good money from the use of the highways, voted down any attempt to get you out of the traffic chaos or to make the ambulance trips unnecessary.

The lobbyists and our representatives all piously agreed that better roads are absolutely vital.

They also agreed that it was absolutely vital that somebody else pay for constructing them and that it was absolutely vital that everybody get re-elected.

Realizing what they had done, after they had made sure they had done it, the Congressmen pointed at the trucking industry lobby as the villain.

And the truckers, after the bills were well sunk, issued statements that Congress should never have acted like that; that President Eisenhower was right when he criticized Congress and demanded reconsideration of its failure to pass a bill.

The same people who caused 100,000 telegrams to flood into Washington demanding the defeat of highway legislation, issued press releases that said the recipients of the telegrams must have misunderstood.

The 100,000 telegrams came from a tiny minority of the American business community.

We wonder what might happen if the American people sent in telegrams themselves, preferably after a frustrating, dangerous day on the roads the Congressmen refused to improve.

In fact, why don't you do it right now?

We don't know whether you mean as much as a lobbyist does to your Congressman, but we're pretty sure a lot of you acting together mean more, much more.

Why not let your Congressman know what you think about the House action last week and tell him to start all over again, right now, and pass a bill?

And tell him to stay in Washington until he does.

### Objection to H. R. 5205, a Bill To Extend to Uniformed Members of the Armed Forces the Same Protection Against Bodily Attack as Is Now Granted to Personnel of the Coast Guard

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5205 is entitled "A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard."

That language would seem to make the bill highly desirable. However, such is not the case.

This proposal has been pending before Congress for a good many years. It has been considered in the Committee on Armed Services and in the former Committee on Military Affairs a number of times, and has in each instance been rejected. On at least one occasion it was considered on the floor of the House and rejected.

Members of the Coast Guard occupy a dual status. They are members of the armed services. In addition, they are charged with the duty of enforcing the customs laws. In this latter category, they are Federal peace officers similar to United States marshals, border patrolmen, or customs agents. As Federal peace officers, they are entitled to, and have, the same protection against bodily attack in the discharge of their duties as is granted to all other Federal peace officers. The law has long provided that protection.

Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps have no duties as peace officers. In a democracy such as ours, they should have no duties as peace officers. Their duties are, and must remain, strictly military duties.

Should the provisions of this bill become law, every affray or fist fight in which a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps is a participant



could be cognizable in the Federal court. This is highly undesirable. The proposal is a mischiefmaker. This bill appeared on the Consent Calendar, a portion of which was called on July 30. Should it be called on the Consent Calendar, or unanimous consent for its passage be requested, I shall object.

What I have stated with reference to H. R. 5205, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], applies also to the similar bills for the same purpose, being H. R. 5279, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]; H. R. 5309, by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and H. R. 5399, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

## Public Works Bill

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in years of yesterday, not long gone by, we heard and read much about confusion along the Potomac. This was part and parcel of the mammoth program to defeat the Democrats by whatever means or methods required. Miraculously, or calculatedly, this great roar died to a faint whisper as the new administration assumed the stately functions of public enterprise. It was fitting, although hardly so completely necessary, that criticism be withheld until the new administration got its feet on the public path in view of the inexperienced nature of its top personnel in matters public. However, at some reasonable point in time, this desire toward charity must yield to necessary examination. By now surely time enough has passed for the new team to become adjusted to the public business they requested the opportunity and duty to administer.

In a spirit of constructive criticism, I hope, I am constrained to object to a current instance of consorting with confusion because it deals with a matter vital to the West and to Colorado in particular. I refer to a recent administrative pronouncement and its actions as they effected reclamation and reclamation development.

On July 15, a press release from the White House carried the news that the President had "with great reluctance" approved the bill making appropriations for the AEC, the TVA, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior—in ordinary language, reclamation—and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army—in ordinary language, flood control, rivers, and harbors—for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

This "great reluctance," the press release said, stemmed from two major considerations. The first of these was the apparent cut in funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, yet simple examination would have revealed to the ad-

ministration that these self-same funds were already included in the upcoming supplemental appropriations bill. This was clearly pointed out on the floor of the House during debate on the above civil works bill. That should have been confusion enough for one day.

However, not to leave well enough alone, this Executive message went on to point out a second factor in the "great reluctance." This was, and I quote:

The large increase in the number of new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. \* \* \* In all, 107 unbudgeted projects were added by Congress. We can only guess what their total cost to the taxpayers will ultimately be. \* \* \* The best guess that can be made at the present time is upward of \$1.5 billion, but when planning is completed, this guess, in the light of past experience, may well prove to be far too low.

Then came the real joker and again I quote from the message:

As a consequence of these considerations, initiation of the added projects cannot be undertaken until the detailed engineering plans have been completed and we have a sound basis for cost estimates.

Now if ever there was a thinly or transparently veiled threat to freeze money appropriated by the Congress, this clearly is it. There was a natural and an immediate reaction from the Congress to whom the Constitution gives the right and duty of providing both policy and appropriations which are to be "faithfully" executed by the President. It was a bit too much coming on top of a similar announcement that funds for maintaining the Marine Corps were to be impounded. Also, we cannot forget a previous message where the President saw fit to take the Congress to task for what he called an infringement upon Executive rights in the Defense appropriation bill. By July 18, a hasty supplemental release from the Bureau of the Budget attempted to redress this error in part by saying that of course there was no intention of impounding these legally appropriated funds. The heat generated by this administration confusion had gotten home somewhere along the administrative ladder.

However, that problem, and the problem of the Corps of Engineers is more in the interest of other areas. On the other hand, reclamation is important to the West—so important as a matter of fact that on July 15th, the very day that the Presidential message announced the Executive's reluctant approval of the money for the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal 1956, the Commissioner of Reclamation was out in Denver reporting in glowing terms the Bureau's program as "one of the largest and most important in recent years." This is what he reported to the Secretary of Interior after a big pow-wow in Denver and then released as information to the press. I realize that it is real handy for the left hand to conceal its activity from the right, especially where different areas with different interests are involved, but it makes life a bit confusing.

It is obvious that one cannot be doing two opposite things at the same time, or for that matter attempting to do such a

thing, without someone suggesting that a pedal extremity is filling some mouth that should have been left closed. I am aware that this blooper will be passed over as lightly as possible in most quarters, but we of the West can hardly stand this pliant political trafficking in our vital programs. Either the program is good and worthy of support, or it should not be praised only where it is known to be popular and discounted elsewhere.

I should like to remind the executive department that the sum appropriated for reclamation construction and rehabilitation for fiscal 1956 is the sum requested in the President's budget—to the exact penny. Now, I will be generous and also point out that to achieve this inestimable station, it was necessary to reduce funds for 3 other projects in order to initiate 3 more new ones. Yes; three whole already authorized construction projects were given funds which were not included in the budget. Add that amount to the seven new starts in the budget, and even these are the only new ones since the Korean emergency, and you have this terrible thing about which the President apprised the Congress of his great reluctance. I cannot conceive of criticism with less factual base or less useful purpose.

The reclamation program can hardly be called substantial at best. In fiscal 1946, as we began to emerge from World War II, appropriations for construction and rehabilitation rose from a wartime \$20 million to a peacetime \$109 million. They reached a postwar peak in 1950 of \$335 million and then went steadily down, due at first to the "no new starts" rule of the Korean emergency. Such rule, however, cannot explain the 1954 fiscal year appropriation of a meager \$116 million. That came in the initial effort, still unsuccessful, of the new administration to balance the budget and before it occurred to them that a reclamation program was not only valuable but necessary. Thus, for 1956 some new starts are proposed and the appropriation recommended is advanced clear up to \$146 million, 10 whole percent over last year's limping program. It may indeed be the largest and most important in recent years, but one must be very careful about the particular years considered. The recommended appropriation still looks a bit sickly compared to the once-achieved \$335 million.

This more careful examination of the general problem and the record which is referred to or ignored as ambition dictates, leaves 100 plus of the unbudgeted new starts, which the President dislikes, completely outside of the reclamation field. His blanket criticism of water resource projects and his careless lumping of reclamation and flood-control programs as deserving the same criticism is unwarranted and unfair. One might conclude that he is just about 2-percent accurate.

I am pleased, as no doubt virtually all westerners are, with the small but significant advance in the reclamation program. It is my hope that the White House in the future can keep its different arms better informed as to the actions of the day.

# Recreation Plans Shelved by United States

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the first directives that went out from Washington upon establishment of the Forest Service 50 years ago was that our public forests should be managed to provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people in the long run.

Today we are seeing a reversal of that historic policy as it applies to recreation, one of the multipurpose uses of these forests.

Each year more Americans spend at least part of their vacations in our national forests. Last year 40 million Americans did so. This was more than twice the total number of visits in 1946.

Last year we appropriated \$1½ million for the Forest Service to operate and maintain recreational facilities, for sanitation and care of some 4,700 public-use areas, and \$210,000 for wildlife management. In other words, we were willing to spend less than 4 cents per visitor on facilities first built in the CCC days and which are falling apart.

But there are also threats to our recreation areas from other directions.

The Hoover Commission task force on water resources disclaims all basic Federal responsibility for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation. These are the responsibility of local government and private citizens, the task force said.

And the Justice Department has announced a new antirecreation policy, as is pointed out in the following article from the July 26 issue of *Labor's Daily*:

#### RECREATION PLANS SHELVED BY UNITED STATES

Conservation groups in the United States are becoming deeply concerned about the present tendency in Washington to eliminate recreation, fishing, and wildlife conservation considerations from Federal programs in the face of a mushrooming demand and growing shortage of recreation facilities in the Nation, says the Washington Window column of the Public Affairs Institute.

National park and forest facilities are now swamped, unable to handle all the skyrocketing number of visitors. Number of hunting and fishing visitors drawn to parks and forests, jumped from 5 million to 11 million between 1947 and 1953. Everywhere recreation facilities are jam-packed and prospects are that demand for such facilities will grow in the next decade as never before.

In face of this situation, conservationists are concerned by such actions as these:

1. The Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources has disclaimed all basic Federal responsibility for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation and similar programs. They are the responsibility of local government and private citizens, the task force reported.

#### PROHIBIT INUNDATION

Furthermore, the task force recommended that in the jurisdiction of all future water projects, no costs or damages be given consideration which are not "susceptible to monetary evaluation." This would exclude the inundation of a scenic area, a great river gorge or natural wildlife habitat from cost considerations. And on the benefit side

of the ledger, the task force recommended that no value be allowed beyond actual sums collectible from users or contributed by non-administering agencies.

2. The Attorney General's office has just announced, in the name of economy, that land taken for dams, reservoirs, and other Federal projects will be strictly limited "to the absolute minimum necessary for the operation and maintenance of the project."

This appears to be a slap at a policy instituted by the Tennessee Valley Authority to buy a strip of land around the border of lakes to assure access by the public, free of charge for recreation uses.

The Justice Department's announcement of the new policy on land acquisition forecasts millions of savings in land costs to the Government and observes that "development of recreational and other incidental facilities by local agencies or private individuals will be made possible without Federal expense."

The new policy of acquiring an absolute minimum of land is already in effect by agreement of construction agencies, the Justice Department announced.

#### SOME LANDS TO BE RETURNED

Some lands already taken for pending projects may be returned to private owners. The announcement said that Corps of Engineers has 25 projects underway in which as much as 186,000 acres—10 percent of all land involved—may be allowed to remain in private hands.

National recreation groups believe that the Federal Government should put greater emphasis, not less, on recreation programs. They point to recent growth in attendance at forests and parks and the huge jump in hunting and fishing licenses reported above.

Prospective further growth of demand for recreation facilities has been studied by Stephen Raushenbush, of the Public Affairs Institute, who foresees a further growth of 50 to 100 percent in use of facilities in the coming decade.

Population growth alone would account for some growth. But other factors are at work. Per capita income is rising, and use of recreation facilities rises with income. The present administration is predicting a 28 percent rise in total disposable income by 1960 and 52 percent by 1965. The per capita rise should be at least half of the total rise, percentage-wise, and will mean a great increase in the per capita use of recreation facilities. In addition to these two factors, population increase and improved incomes, there is the prospect of shorter workweek, longer weekends and extended annual vacations due to increases in the labor force and increased productivity of all labor.

#### DEMANDS MAY RISE

Taking all these factors into consideration, Raushenbush reported that demand for outdoor recreation facilities "may easily be up 50 percent to 100 percent in the next 10 years."

Conservation groups point out that the recent Hoover Commission and administration actions in the recreation, fish and wildlife fields are in sharp contrast to recommendations of the Truman Water Policy Commission of 1950-51. This recommended (1) that recreational opportunities be given fullest consideration in planning all projects; (2) that water resources programs be coordinated with local, State, and regional recreational programs and (3) that projects be constructed and operated "to insure full realization for their recreational values."

Further, the Truman Commission specifically recommended:

"Suitable lands adjacent to all Federal reservoirs should be reserved and made available for public recreation use."

That recommendation is the exact opposite of the current Justice Department policy announcement.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government must shoulder its share of the responsibility for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation, and similar programs regardless of what the Hoover Commission recommends or the Attorney General orders.

It is for this reason that I introduced H. R. 1823 which would—

First. Declare public recreation use of the national forests to be a policy of Congress.

Second. Earmark 10 percent of the national forests receipts each year for development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use, improvement, and maintenance of wildlife habitat and provisions for adequate safety, sanitation, and health in connection with uses of the national forests. The amount so set aside shall not exceed \$5½ million in any 1 year. None of the money shall be used for land acquisition.

Third. Provide that fees, already authorized, collected for use of any substantially improved recreational area where special services or facilities are provided, shall go into this special improvement fund instead of into the Treasury.

Our national forests are making money for us. Receipts in fiscal 1953 totaled \$73 million. That same year Congress appropriated about \$62 million for the Forest Service. So \$11 million went into the Treasury from operation of our national forests. We should reinvest some of this profit in the business.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has about as much land under concrete—in highways, streets, and parking lots—as it has in wilderness areas. If our children and their children are to get to know and love the outdoors as we do, we must act now to preserve our vanishing wilderness.

## Tribute to Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 11, 1955, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, a distinguished Representative from Connecticut, made what many of us thought was an eloquent address entitled "How High Is the Summit?" This speech of Congressman DODD was not only eloquently delivered but contained sound and courageous advice to our Nation.

Shortly after July 27, Congressman DODD received a letter from former President Harry S. Truman, which I hereinafter set forth. Former President Truman certainly has paid Congressman DODD an unusual tribute. It is typical of the gallant and courageous Harry S. Truman that despite his retirement from the high office of President, he



nevertheless follows the affairs of our Nation and reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is with pleasure that I include the President's letter in the RECORD, not only as a tribute to Congressman Dodd, but also as a reminder to all that Harry S. Truman's service to the Nation has not ended and that is something for which the Nation should be grateful.

The letter follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., July 27, 1955.

HON. THOMAS J. DODD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DODD: I have just received a copy of the RECORD for July 11 which contains your speech, the subject of which is How High Is the Summit?

It is one of the best statements on the subject I have ever read, and I am certainly glad you were thoughtful enough to put it into the RECORD. I congratulate you heartily on it.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

### Complete Overhaul Called for in Public Assistance Program for Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 7848 proposing a sweeping overhaul of the public-assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act. The public-assistance section now makes Federal grants-in-aid available to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, needy children, and totally and permanently disabled. As State legislatures are permitted to determine who can qualify for such aid and the amount granted, few if any of the programs in the 48 States are alike. It would appear that many of the State legislatures have gone back 350 years to the poor laws of Queen Elizabeth's time to harass and intimidate the needy of America. The poor laws of Queen Elizabeth have no place in the statute books of our States. England repealed them long ago. Now it is up to the United States Congress to do the same in our country, and my bill will give the States 2 years' time for their legislatures to meet and to accomplish this.

The manner in which we reward the needy of other countries and neglect our own is shameful. It is my belief that the time has come for our Nation to "grow up" and treat needy Americans not as "unwanted citizens" but with love and understanding toward those who have outlived their money or have become handicapped and unable to work.

These amendments will establish a "legislative intent" that public assistance shall be administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life, and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or political affiliation; and that the assistance laws be liberally construed. In

view of the fact that the House of Representatives has already passed a bill, now pending in the Senate, to lower the age from 65 to 62 for women to receive social-security benefits, I am proposing in my bill that this same privilege be extended also to women who are in need of old-age assistance at age 62.

Some features of the bill are as follows:

First. Since the Federal grants-in-aid to States for public assistance apply to the aged, the blind, dependent children and the permanently and totally disabled, the bill provides that the States cannot window shop on these programs but must adopt all of them.

Second. The program is to be administered by each State so as to insure uniform treatment of the needy in all its political subdivisions.

Third. No person receiving such public aid shall be deemed a pauper, and no warrant drawn in payment shall contain any reference to indigency or pauperism.

Fourth. A floor of \$1,200 is established under the amount of personal property which a recipient is allowed to have. Household furnishings, etc., are allowed in addition to an insurance policy or burial arrangement up to \$500 in value. Any amount greater than this would be considered in the \$1,200.

Fifth. Prohibits any discrimination of sex.

These new provisions were added to a bill previously introduced by me which included:

(a) Raising the present ceiling of \$55 to \$100 monthly for each recipient wherein the Federal Government makes available funds to the States. The amount of Federal funds made available would be greater to States with low per capita income and match 50-50 the wealthier States. Additional Federal funds would be made available for the needy-children program.

(b) The aged and handicapped would be allowed to earn up to \$50 per month and needy children up to \$30 per month to supplement their assistance checks. At the present any amount which they earn is deducted from their monthly payment.

(c) Recipients may own a home of an assessed value, less all encumbrances, up to \$5,000 free from the imposition of a lien. The ownership of a home will not be used as an excuse to deduct a so-called occupancy value from the payments to the needy.

(d) Elimination by some States of the practice of using the Federal law to enforce collections from the relatives of recipients.

(e) The prohibition against publishing the names of recipients will be restored to the Federal law.

(f) The value of any United States surplus food made available shall not be deducted from the recipient's aid.

(g) If a citizen in need does not meet State-resident requirements, the Federal Government would direct benefits until qualifying residence is established. I would like to point out that many of these realistic amendments in my new bill, H. R. 7948, had already been adopted by the State legislature in California.

According to the latest official United States Government figures, there are 2,552,881 people on old-age assistance receiving an average of \$51.85 per month; 103,045 blind persons are receiving an average of \$56.74 per month; 2,253,174 needy children are receiving an average of \$24 per month, and 229,893 physically handicapped people are receiving an average of \$55.03 per month.

### Our Water Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, although it lacks the glamor of a hydroelectric dam and the traveler appeal of a national park improvement program, the soil and water conservation program of the Department of Agriculture has a direct effect on every citizen and taxpayer of the United States. There is no national highway leading to these many projects or no conspicuous sign advertising the accomplishment of any Government agency or bureau.

Soil conservation development is continually growing and progressing at the grassroots level on the crossroads to some degree in every State of the Union. In the great Middle West where the basis of our economy is agriculture this conservation development has been especially outstanding. It symbolizes cooperation between the individual landowner or operator and Government agencies on the national, State, and local level. There is probably no program in the field of government in which cooperation is so vital as in the soil-conservation program. This cooperation is not only financial, but also in overall objectives, method of procedure, and means of implementation. In my opinion, that is the principal reason that the progress of this program has not been spectacular but has always been moving forward on a sound, practical basis. Although I heartily endorse the principle of local financial responsibility by the participant in any phase of government assistance I do feel that this program has not received sufficient recognition from the viewpoint of government financial assistance when analyzed and evaluated according to the objectives anticipated by its development. Whereas some Federal programs receive 100 percent financial assistance from the Federal Treasury the conservation program receives assistance on an average of about 50 percent of the cost by the Government and 50 percent to be assumed by the benefiting area or persons.

Either conservation practices should be brought up to the same level as other agency programs or the programs of other agencies should be reduced to approximately the same division of financial responsibility by the Government and the benefiting areas.

Mr. Speaker, I take considerable pride in the advancement of conservation work in my district and wish to include in this unanimous consent request an editorial expressing recognition and results of this program in my district written by Byron Guise, the editor of the Marysville Advocate, and later reprinted in the Topeka Daily Capital:

**LONG IS THE WAY**

As long as the sun shall shine, the stars twinkle, the rain come, and the moon gleam, Marshall County will be able to produce food from the soil. It all began back in the late 20's by a few farmers who had the courage to follow the ideas promulgated by the extension service of Kansas State College. The ideas were simple: Make the running water walk, and keep the soil where it is.

Simple as it may seem these ideas were not to gain foothold like the popularity of a movie star. On the contrary the ideas were so new that few accepted them as sound. Had not the land produced the best wheat, the finest corn, the most luscious alfalfa, the good oats, potatoes, and other crops? Why do silly things when the land was still doing a good job?

But the promoters of the new idea knew full well that sooner or later the land out here in the Great Plains Empire would be depleted of some of its most necessary elements, in addition to being washed into the Big Blue River, the Kaw, the Missouri, and the Mississippi. However, when a man lives on the same farm for years, he fails to notice the changing of his land as does another who goes away for years and then comes back.

Inserting the soil-saving idea into the minds of many a Marshall County farmer was something like trying to sell an airplane to a man a year or so after it is first invented. The idea did not take. It took virtual revival meetings to get the idea to soak in. Then here and there a few accepted. Gradually a few terraces were seen over the countryside. A few farmers began farming on the contour. Some built check dams.

When it seemed as if the idea never would become popular, all of a sudden the owners of the land and the tenants saw the need. In recent years soil saving has fast become a must in Marshall County. Farmers who have followed these practices for several years are making better and bigger profits than their neighbors. And when they want to sell their land they can command more for it.

The day is coming in Marshall County when an unterraced farm, or a farm not protected by soil-saving practices, will be an outlaw. And 25 years or more ago the farmer who carried on these practices had what some called an outlaw farm. (Marysville Advocate.)

**Biggest Mistake Congress Made**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. RUSSELL V. MACK**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the present Democratic Congress to pass a highway bill was a disappointment and a disgrace.

The Nation needs more and better roads to save lives and to prevent the crippling of citizens. Experts estimate

the economic savings on hospital and medical bills, on wear and tear on equipment, in time on commercial vehicles, and through lower insurance rates at \$4,300,000,000 annually. These economic savings would more than pay the cost of building the needed highways.

Concerning the failure of Congress to pass highway legislation, the Democrat and Chronicle, of Rochester, N. Y., in disgust said editorially:

Lack of action on a highway program is a disgrace. The national road situation will grow worse before Representatives and Senators get back to Washington next year. The delay is inexcusable and a black mark on the Congress.

**Record of the 84th Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. MELVIN PRICE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 84th Congress has ended with a record in which most Members, I think, feel a sense of achievement.

It has been a Democratic Congress serving with President Eisenhower, a Republican. Not for generations, not since the 46th Congress in 1879 when Rutherford B. Hayes was President, has there been a session where both Houses were controlled by Democrats working with a Republican Chief Executive in the coordinate business of Government.

The record shows how wrong President Eisenhower was in the last campaign in predicting a "political cold war" unless the people followed his bidding and elected members of his own partisan group to control.

There has been no political cold war. The people's business has been handled carefully but without stalling. Under the firm and experienced leadership of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, House Floor Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, and Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, the necessary appropriation bills and many bills on basic legislation were expeditiously managed.

On foreign policy, Democrats in Congress gave Mr. Eisenhower support at many critical moments when he could not depend on his own Republicans.

On domestic policy, Democrats changed, corrected, and revised Mr. Eisenhower's programs. For this we have no apology. The President is surrounded by people from a particular group—big-business men and big-business men's lawyers—and he listens to no advice except the advice from this special-interest group. We in Congress have been forced to correct him.

There has been a vast difference between this Democratic 84th Congress working with a Republican President and the Republican 80th Congress working against former President Truman.

Mr. Truman got victory in vital foreign-policy matters in the 80th Congress by holding the solid support of Democrats and winning just a handful of Re-

publicans. On domestic policy he was ruined; the Taft-Hartley law was driven through over his veto; the way was paved for other laws to go through over his veto.

In the 84th Congress President Eisenhower began on foreign policy with a badly split group of Republicans. The senior Republicans in the Senate—his floor leader, many ranking leaders in the GOP policy committee and the important Appropriations and Finance Committees—were against him. Democrats saved him.

Let us look at the record. If President Eisenhower had been compelled to follow the pressures exerted by his own Republicans, he would have attempted a naval blockade of Red China. He would have attempted atomic bombs or ground troops to save Indochina. He would even have rejected the idea of conversations at the summit with the Russians at Geneva.

It was the solid support of Democrats in Congress that enabled him to follow Harry S. Truman's policy in rejecting the idea of rash warfare in the Formosa Strait and the Far East. It was the wise words of a Democrat, Senator WALTER S. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that encouraged him, reluctantly, to go to Geneva for the conference at the summit.

In the field of foreign policy the official GOP congressional leaders were silenced, at last, and forced to abandon foolish talk about appeasement. Democratic support set the President free from the chains his own party tried to fasten on him. Is this the political cold war Mr. Eisenhower predicted? The President has reason to be grateful that the people ignored his requests and elected Democrats who have a sense of national responsibility in the field of foreign policy.

This Democratic Congress has not been a rubber-stamp Congress. There are five issues in which I disagreed with the President on domestic matters. In each of these five matters we in Congress have reversed and rejected the President's notions or he has belatedly confessed he was wrong.

He made a shocking departure from precedent when he named an Iowa Republican figure, Allen Whitfield, as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no opinion about the matters brought out about Mr. Whitfield in a trustee's capacity, involving an estate. I know that the appointment was wrong for the Atomic Energy Commission because it was strictly a political appointment. Mr. Whitfield had been an active Republican partisan and had been urged on Mr. Eisenhower for partisan reasons. Mr. Whitfield finally asked the President to withdraw his name, and Mr. Eisenhower obliged. A place on the AEC is no place for a partisan, and I would be as firmly opposed to nomination of a Democratic politician as a Republican politician.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I disagreed with the President's proposals to take a go-slow policy on the Air Force and to chop down conventional military ground forces.



We were told, sometimes with something like contempt, that we in Congress should not question President Eisenhower's judgment as a military man. But we have our own responsibilities in Congress, and we may reasonably take account of the fact that although a soldier the President never before had the job of making decisions for the civilian high command.

Before the session ended, the Air Force admitted we were right in protesting the go-slow policy in equipping our fliers with modern, high-speed jet planes. The Russians surprised some of the self-proclaimed experts—but not our committee—by their show of modern airpower last May. The administration had to come to Congress and ask permission to spend more money to speed up procurement—the very money we had tried to give them and they insisted earlier they did not need.

The administration was forced to accept an authorization of a bigger Marine Corps than it recommended. We in Congress cannot compel the administration to spend the money; we could not save the Army from the slash in its size that General Ridgway vehemently protested. But we know that the administration was wrong about the Air Force and we have urged it to maintain at least the present strength of the Marine Corps.

On the Dixon-Yates contract, I fought the President since the day the ill-fated private utility deal was announced. Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, and I raised the first warning flags, last year, that an attempt to cripple the TVA through the Atomic Energy Commission was a gross abuse of the AEC, an independent agency, for political purposes.

The longer and harder the President pushed Dixon-Yates, the deeper he fell into trouble. His subordinates were shown to have falsified the record at least by omission; they were shown guilty of a lack of candor. The President himself repeatedly promised that the "full record" would be made public, but a special Senate subcommittee kept on revealing inconsistencies, deceptions, and improper interference by the White House itself with the independent agencies, including the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The President finally ordered the Dixon-Yates deal canceled, using as a lame excuse the determination of the city of Memphis to build its own power plant rather than buy Dixon-Yates electricity. The plain fact is that the deal had to be canceled because it had landed the administration in a mess. If the President had listened to Congressman HOLIFIELD and me last year, he might have got out of the mess more quickly.

One other matter I feel deeply about. I made the first public protest in 1953 when Mr. Eisenhower, in his first state of the Union message, misrepresented and distorted former President Truman's purposes in sending the 7th Fleet in 1950 to guard the Formosa Strait. Mr. Eisenhower pretended that Harry S. Truman's orders had the effect of "shielding" the Chinese Communists from the Nationalists on Formosa. This was a

gross misstatement of fact, and President Eisenhower has now admitted it.

What Truman did was to use the 7th Fleet to prevent the war in Korea from spreading southward to the Formosa Strait. He ordered the 7th Fleet to enforce a kind of cease-fire. And what is Eisenhower trying to get now? He is trying to get by negotiated agreement exactly the cease-fire that President Truman imposed. He has ordered a special ambassador to meet with a special Chinese Communist ambassador in Geneva to discuss first our prisoners in Chinese jails and then other subjects, including whether the Reds will agree to a Formosa cease-fire.

He began talking about a cease-fire as early as last January, at a news conference, and he has repeatedly indicated that he wants such a cease-fire. We Democrats do not insult Dwight D. Eisenhower by charging that this is appeasement, that he is "shielding" the Chinese Reds. I simply wish he had not distorted former President Truman's motives about the 7th Fleet.

Let me reiterate these matters. I publicly disagreed with the President on five issues—the Whitfield nomination to the AEC, the proposed Air Force cuts, the proposed cuts in military ground forces, the Dixon-Yates contract, the misrepresentation of Truman's orders to the 7th Fleet. As the Member of the House directly responsible to the people of the Illinois 24th District, I have no reason to regret or withdraw anything I said publicly on these items. I can point to the record to show that subsequent events have proven my position correct.

When we turn to the field of social legislation, domestic legislation for the general welfare, we Democrats again have proved ourselves something more than rubber stamps. Here we have a great group of issues—housing, minimum wages, social security, public health, highways, unemployment insurance, farm program, taxes. These are programs which Democrats nourished through the New Deal and Fair Deal years.

Very frequently we Democrats declined to accept the President's advice on legislation on such matters. We knew his advice arose from that narrow little group of inner-circle counselors. We broadened and liberalized Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations.

Minimum wages is a good example. The President proposed an increase in the minimum wage in interstate industry from 75 to 90 cents an hour. The Democratic Congress thought that was inadequate.

The new figure of \$1 an hour was justified by increases in the cost of living and by increases in productivity of workers—the output of workers per hour. It was justified by the doctrine of supporting purchasing power so that the corner grocer, the corner druggist, has good customers who can pay their bills.

The only employers in interstate industry the \$1-an-hour rate can hurt are sweatshop employers. The bill for \$1 an hour seemed to us a fair compromise below the \$1.25 urgently requested by both

the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I must add a word about the performance on this bill of Secretary of Labor Mitchell. He refused to endorse the \$1-an-hour figure until after it had been voted by both the House and the Senate. He finally disclosed that he would recommend that the President sign the measure, but he coupled with this snide comments that it was only half a bill, because Congress did not widen coverage of protected workers as well as raise the minimum rate.

Secretary Mitchell was given every chance by our senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, to endorse specific proposals on broadening coverage. He ran away from the chance, and he has little excuse now to criticize what the Congress did in passing a better minimum-wage law than he recommended.

The House passed by an overwhelming vote a new bill to liberalize the social-security system. The chief provisions were to provide benefits to totally disabled workers at the age of 50—instead of making them wait until age 65; to make benefits payable to women workers or wives and widows at age 62 instead of age 65; to provide for benefits for incapacitated children beyond the present cut-off age of 18 years.

This bill did not get through the Senate this year. It did not get through because the Eisenhower administration opposed it. It failed to pass because the resigned Welfare Secretary, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, fought it in both House committee and Senate committee.

Secretary Hobby's technique was to complain that the changes had not been studied enough, and besides she had some 17 other proposed changes she wanted the committees to consider. The three major changes proposed by the House bill actually have been studied for years, and everyone's arguments and all the cost estimates are in the record. A bill to improve the social-security system undoubtedly will be passed by the Senate next session, and we in the House helped contribute by pushing the issue this session.

The housing bill was blocked until near the very end of the session by the opposition of all four Republicans on the House Rules Committee. The stalemate was finally broken only Thursday, July 28, when a few of the Republicans on the committee surrendered and agreed to let the whole House of Representatives vote on housing measures. The housing bill finally adopted was better in many of its provisions than President Eisenhower's proposals—and Republicans fought it both because of that and because of its authorization of 45,000 new public housing units this year. The Democratic Senate bill would have authorized 145,000 units per year, but the Republican opposition in the House blocked this figure. Even so, we boosted the President's request by 10,000 units—above the 35,000 he asked—and got rid of some old restrictions that had the effect of crippling execution of public housing programs.

The highways bill eventually fell by the wayside, but it will be brought up

again next year in the second session, and I am sure a sound bill, with adequate provision for financing a great new highway network by pay-as-we-go revenues, will be passed.

The key fact is that both the House and the Senate this year rejected President Eisenhower's insistence on "gimmick" financing, through a 30-year bond issue outside the so-called national debt and with the taxpayers burdened with a tremendous interest load of \$11.5 billion to carry the 30-year bonds. We in Congress were unwilling to authorize a so-called highway program in which 55 cents would have gone for interest charges in payment for every dollar actually invested in roads.

It is costing the people a great deal less to wait for a few months for new highways, unpleasant though the wait may be, than if Congress had adopted the "gimmick" financing proposed by the White House.

The record of Congress in the public-health field is spotty—but once again the results arise principally from the shortsighted proposals the administration insisted on. President Eisenhower's inadequate program of health reinsurance involving private insurance companies was firmly rejected. It never came out of either House or Senate committees.

A sharp issue was the handling of the Salk polio-vaccine program. Here again the Eisenhower-Hobby proposals were inadequate and lacking in generosity and humanitarianism. Our great neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada, handled the inoculation of Canadian children with a minimum of fuss and error and a maximum of efficiency. One of our Atlantic neighbors, the small country of Denmark, gave all Danish children practically complete immunity from polio by using the Salk vaccine technique wisely. But Mrs. Hobby claimed that she could not possibly have foreseen the demand of American parents for protection of their children.

On unemployment compensation, a necessary part of our modern system to safeguard families from temporary industrial layoffs and to protect purchasing power, Mr. Mitchell's Labor Department opposed Federal action. But hearings were held which will form a groundwork for progress in the future by Congress.

The House passed a bill to repeal Agriculture Secretary Benson's so-called flexible farm price support plan passed last year by the Republican 83d Congress. We Democrats do not believe that the way to handle the problems of farmers is to cut their support prices ruthlessly by calling the new plan "flexible." I have no doubt that the Democratic Senate will move in the same direction as the House next year.

The House this year passed a bill to override the common Eisenhower practice of granting most tax relief to corporations and corporation stockholders. Corporations and stockholders deserve fair and equal treatment, but no more. The House tax bill, enacted after Speaker RAYBURN made a dramatic personal appeal, would have chopped a flat \$20

a year from the payable taxes of everybody. If anyone thinks this is trivial, let him remember that even a well-paid factory worker with 3 children may make only \$3,700 a year. To him, a tax benefit of \$100—\$20 each for himself, his wife, and his 3 children—would be a welcome gain in what he is able to spend for food, housing, and clothing. Once again, I have no doubt that the Senate will join the House in moving in this direction next year.

One other matter should be mentioned about the relations of President Eisenhower and Democrats in Congress. Most of us have given strong support to the President on many issues. I myself am listed by Congressional Quarterly, an independent research group dealing with Congress, as having supported Mr. Eisenhower much more frequently than the average of Illinois Republican Members of the House.

It is necessary to say frankly, however, that many Democrats were infuriated by President Eisenhower's stern schoolmaster attitude toward us after we had saved one after another of his foreign-policy programs.

The very day the President chose to pull out of his pocket an obviously prepared list of measures, and to complain to a news conference that we were stalling about these measures, was the day when his own housing bill was blocked in the House Rules Committee by the votes of all four Republicans on that committee. The Democrats voted 6 to 2 in the committee to send the housing measure to the floor; all 4 Republicans voted to stall.

It is all very well for President Eisenhower to pay frequent tribute to Senator GEORGE's kindness to him. Speaker RAYBURN of the House has also been kind—kinder than the President seems to realize. It was SAM RAYBURN who saved Mr. Eisenhower's foreign-trade bill in the House, against the opposition of most Republicans. We Democrats have no apology, I repeat, for liberalizing Mr. Eisenhower's domestic programs or at least blocking them in the shortsighted form he proposes.

As many of you know, much of the work of Congress is done in committees. That is how we divide up the tasks and try to become well-informed in the fields to which we are assigned. I am fortunate in my committees—Armed Services, which covers the defense of our country, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which has jurisdiction over and responsibility for all our programs on atomic energy for defense and for peaceful use of the atom. I am chairman of the Atomic Energy Subcommittee on Research and Development.

All through a session of Congress, and particularly toward the end, the burden of the important committees is a serious one. On last Thursday, for example, when the House itself held a long session involving important bills, I was in five separate committee and subcommittee meetings.

My own Subcommittee on Research and Development was given the last-minute task of devising ways and means to end the stalemate over President

Eisenhower's proposed atomic-powered merchant ship. The President's original proposal was not a sound one, and most of us on the Atomic Energy Committee recognized it—both Republicans and Democrats. But we also realized that we had a responsibility to work out the soundest substitute we could, so that we could both demonstrate America's good intentions regarding the atom and advance the development of practical atomic engines for merchant vessels. This is the kind of purpose for which our Subcommittee on Research and Development was created, and we accepted our job.

At the same time the work of the House as a whole is important, and we had to leave our committee work occasionally to go to the floor and cast our votes, on rollcalls, on measures of intimate concern to the people of our districts. I was present to vote against the natural gas bill, which would reduce Federal regulation of gas prices and eventually lead to the piling up of new charges to people who heat their homes and heat their water or cook their meals with natural gas.

As this report is written I am preparing to leave for Geneva, Switzerland, to participate in the first international conference on the creative, civilized use of atomic energy for the benefit of men everywhere. This conference will be held under the auspices of the United Nations.

I will be back in the 24th District of Illinois as soon as my duties in Geneva permit, and I will be available for many months, before the next session of Congress convenes in January, for reports to the people of our district.

### Hoover Commission Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, August 1, 1955*

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission among its surveys made one covering the field of transportation. It came, in some instances, to strange conclusions.

It was the purpose of the Hoover Commission to improve the operations, the efficiency, of the executive branch of the Government. Yet, one of its recommendations, if put into effect, would have merged the traffic management operations of the TVA into those operated at far greater cost to the taxpayer by the General Services Administration.

The report itself shows that the payroll costs for TVA traffic management are only 1 cent per ton of freight. This is the lowest cost for any governmental agency. On the other hand, the Central Traffic Management's payroll costs run to 98 cents per ton, or nearly 100 times as much.

As a matter of fact, the costs of the Central Traffic Agency are \$11.39 per



\$100 of freight charges, which appears to me enormously high.

The Hoover Commission itself declared that the TVA has done an extremely good job of traffic management, a job beyond criticism. It is clearly faulty reasoning to turn a job which has been done so well and so cheaply over to an agency which is less efficient and far more costly.

### "Blind Spot" in American Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. LEE METCALF**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald calls attention to a most unfortunate and longstanding "blind spot" in American education.

Mr. Frederick D. Eddy, of the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., uses these words to describe the absence of foreign languages from the curriculums in our elementary schools.

Such courses, he says in the letter which follows, would "give an increasing number of our citizens the linguistic equipment to live with and to understand foreign peoples":

#### "BLIND SPOT" IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

News items such as President Eisenhower's appeal in Geneva for a free international flow of visitors, your July 20 article on Briefing To Mend Ways of Yanks Abroad and the report by Miss Emille M. White on Languages in the District Schools in your June 13 edition keep bringing up a most unfortunate and longstanding "blind spot" in American education.

I mean a blind spot for the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools, for giving an increasing number of our citizens the linguistic equipment to live with and to understand foreign peoples.

Why, it may be asked, should foreign languages be started in elementary school? The answer, put very briefly, is that understanding and speaking a foreign language is not learned; it is blotted up with ease by youngsters under 13 or 14. After puberty it becomes increasingly more difficult to learn a new language well.

In other parts of the world, including the U. S. S. R., it has long been realized that putting off foreign language learning until high school is an obvious case of "too little and too late," and so outside our borders most spoken languages are started in grade school, and are continued for 6 to 10 years.

Inside the United States there is a young but rapidly growing trend in this direction, and Washington, D. C., can indeed take pride, as Miss White says, in being one of the pioneer cities in the movement. Let's put it more accurately: Washington can take pride in having school personnel with the vision, competence, and devotion shown by the two heads of the department of foreign languages, by other administrative officers, and by some parent groups; Washington can take pride in a civic-minded and world-minded station like WRC-TV that has cooperated so effectively in the citywide grade school foreign language program.

But little pride can be taken in the facts behind some telling phrases in Miss White's report—"the program . . . is being conducted without financial support; . . . regular elementary classroom teachers . . . offered to do the language teaching on a purely voluntary basis . . ."; we might hope for the kind of community support which would lead before too long a time to the inclusion of provision for a continuing program of languages taught by trained teachers in the regular school budget."

Commissioners of Washington, a world Capital, please take note. Citizens of Washington, speak up to your Commissioners.

In the suburban areas near Washington a situation exists that, far from arousing any kind of pride, should make world-minded citizens in these parts sit up and take alarmed notice.

In Maryland—specifically, in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties—there is no official plan whatever to introduce foreign-language study into the elementary schools—in spite of real personal interest in the matter shown by many school officials from the highest ranks to the lowest.

The Maryland State Department of Education committee report, The Place of Foreign Language in the Total School Program, offers a promising and forward-looking plan. A few tentative steps have been taken by the education department to explore ways and means of implementing it. In short, the blueprint for Maryland schools is there, but action on it seems to be very slow.

Action will almost certainly come faster if the citizens of Maryland, aware of the linguistic provincialism in their elementary schools, will make their voices heard by local and State school officials.

For further information on this subject, interested persons or groups may contact their district, State, or county education department, or the Office of Education Committee on Foreign Language Teaching, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C., or they may write to the Foreign Language Program, Modern Language Association, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N. Y.

FREDERICK D. EDDY,

Associate Professor, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington.

WASHINGTON.

Our colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has introduced a resolution which would eliminate this "blind spot." House Joint Resolution 305 would make it United States policy to encourage the study of foreign languages by citizens of the United States.

The present position of the United States in world affairs necessitates greater contact between our citizens and those of other nations. Increased knowledge of foreign languages will help our peacetime policy and will be invaluable in event of war.

### The Small Family Farmer

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HOWARD H. BAKER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in the days of our fathers a certain type of

hired man on the farm was described as "a great woodchopper in summer, a great hand with a scythe in winter."

The majority party in this session of Congress professes great concern for the welfare of the family farm. They almost seem to resent the idea that anyone, other than they, can, or will, or should help the low-income farmer.

They have blithely tried to restore the high, rigid price supports which have been clearly seen to help most of the larger and more prosperous farmers. Their motto seems to be: "Billions for the rich, not even millions for the poor."

The request for \$30 million, plus certain enabling legislation, to start a rural-development program has fallen upon deaf ears. Truly, there are those who are "woodchoppers" for the small family farmer in the summer of helping the large farmer. They, too, can "swing a scythe" for the small family farmer in the winter of economy or the rush of adjournment.

### Interview for Everybody's Daily

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of the interview which I granted to Everybody's Daily and which appeared in the July 27, 1955, edition of that Buffalo newspaper:

AS MEMBER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI PRESENTED MANY ANTI-RED BILLS

(Exclusive interview with Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin)

Question. Undoubtedly, this has been one of the most interesting sessions you have ever attended. How many years have you been serving as a Congressman?

Answer. I am presently serving my fourth 2-year term in the House of Representatives. Prior to my election to Congress, I served two terms in the Wisconsin State Senate.

Question. Inasmuch as the important work of Congress is done through the committee system, of what committees are you a member, and what are their special purposes?

Answer. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is in charge of legislation dealing with our foreign policy—with such measures as the mutual-security program, the point 4 program, and so on.

Question. As one of the ranking more important members of these committees, and because legislation is always introduced through the committee function, what legislation have you been responsible for, and why?

Answer. That is a very broad question. I have sponsored, among others, bills calling for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy, for the investigation of Communist atrocities in Korea, for the condemnation of the Soviet domination of Poland, for the admission of Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for the creation of a Pacific pact union on the style of NATO, and a number of others.

Question. Undoubtedly you are planning to introduce other legislation. Would you want to tell us what it will be and the purpose of it?

Answer. I have no immediate plans for the introduction of new legislation dealing with foreign policy issues. As you know, the present session is rapidly approaching an end and for that reason it would not be feasible to introduce new legislation at this time. Further, I have a number of bills pending and pertaining to other fields, and I will try to secure consideration for those measures before Congress adjourns.

Question. Would you say that the present session, which is considered an off-year as far as elections are concerned, is going to be as productive of good work for the country and American people as some of the other ones you have been a member?

Answer. I believe that this session will go down into history as a constructive and productive session. Congress has done a considerable amount of work on various important measures. A comprehensive defense budget has been approved; the reciprocal trade-agreements program has been extended; a number of vital treaties have been approved, the mutual-security program is in the process of being continued, and so on. In addition, progress has been made on social-security revisions, on increases in the minimum wage, on hospital and school construction assistance program, and the reorganization of the military Reserves, and on the housing legislation. This, in my estimation, is a considerable record of achievement in an off-year session.

Question. As a member of the majority party, would you say that the average Congressman is first concerned with the political significance of everything that comes before him, or is he more interested in the overall legislation to be considered, with the effect on his own constituents, or his country as a whole?

Answer. I would say—and I am very sincere in saying this—that by and large, the average Congressman is primarily interested in seeing that the legislation he supports is sound, and in our national interest. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule. In some cases, individual Representatives will fight for bills which would benefit some segments of the country and particular groups, even though such bills may not be consistent with the overall interests of the Nation. Generally, however, they look first to see if a particular bill will serve the interests of the country, and vote for the bill if that is the case—even though their vote may not be fully understood or appreciated by some of the people back home in their district.

Question. Inasmuch as your own constituents elected you to Congress, would you say your first consideration on all legislation, or the majority of legislation, is to your constituents or your country as a whole? What are good examples of this type of consideration on your part?

Answer. Now to logically answer your question, I must first point out that what is good for our Nation, at the same time benefits each and every one of us. In other words, there is very seldom any clash between a local and a national interest. Legislation which is good for the Nation as a whole is not harmful to the people of a given locality, because the people of that locality benefit from the healthy state of the Nation.

There are, of course, times when local and national interests do not appear to be identical. We had an issue of this type arise recently in conjunction with the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Now our trade program has definitely benefited our Nation during the past two decades. There is little doubt about it. Nevertheless, there are some firms which are hurt by foreign competition. In order to ascertain to what extent the people of the Fourth District of Wisconsin are affected by foreign trade, I asked the Li-

brary of Congress to conduct a thorough study of this subject. With the cooperation of my office, the Library of Congress for 8 months studied the impact of foreign trade on Milwaukee. The results of the study surprised many people. The study showed that the majority of our manufacturing industries, employing a vast majority of our industrial workers, are deeply interested in foreign trade and benefit from it to a large extent. To vote against the reciprocal trade-agreements program, therefore, would be against the interests of the majority of our workers—even though one company felt that it would not benefit from such a vote. For that reason, I voted for the program.

Question. What do you think is the most important legislation matter that has come before you in this session, and has it been worked out correctly and constructively?

Answer. I feel that some of the important pieces of legislation have not been worked out as yet during the present session. The issue of aid to school construction, the question of the highway program, the minimum wage increase, the subject of social-security revision—these and other vital measures are still being worked on. We will not be able to accurately evaluate the fruits of this session until final action will be taken on these bills.

At this point, however, I would say that the action on the defense budget, on the trade program, on the mutual-security program, and the plugging up of the loopholes in the Republican Revenue Act of 1954, constitute constructive actions on the part of this Congress.

Question. Being a member of the opposition party of the President, would you say the present handling of the Far East and European situation has been in the best interests of the country. If not, what suggestions do you offer?

Answer. This again, is an extremely broad question, and it is difficult to answer it briefly. Generally, I would say that the present handling of the European situation has been much more constructive and sensible than our country's actions with regard to the Far East. In that area, we have been, in effect, retreating for 3 years. The Korean truce was not satisfactory, as the subsequent events have clearly shown. The Indochina truce gave the Communists a new conquest to boast about, and consigned several million peoples to Communist domination and slavery. In addition, it has imperiled the rest of Indochina and Southeast Asia in general. Neither has much progress been made in resolving the critical issues between Formosa and Red China.

As to the suggestions that may be offered on this subject, I would like to refer you to the two reports issued by the Special Study Missions to the Far East, of which I was a member. Some of the actions recommended by my committee have been taken by the administration—unfortunately, these actions came late, and fell far short of our recommendations. The problem of doing "too little, too late" has been at the bottom of the difficulties which had to be faced in that area today.

Question. Do you agree with a recent survey that 91 percent of the Americans are willing to risk war, if all peaceful means of releasing our prisoners of war in China fail?

Answer. The thought of an all-out war is, to borrow a phrase from one of the statesmen of our times, "unbearable." A nuclear war may actually destroy our entire civilization. There is no doubt about this—the unleashing of the deadly weapons which we possess, as well as those which the Communists possess, may bring about such destruction that it may take centuries to rebuild the world.

Knowing this, I do not believe that our people would lightly recommend that our Government plunge our Nation, and the entire world, into an all-out conflict with

the Communists. I firmly believe that we must leave no stone unturned to secure the release of our men held by the Communists in China. I have repeatedly urged that this be done, and I am confident that our Government is doing everything possible in this respect. Whether an all-out war should be started if these peaceful efforts fail is something that cannot be decided on the strength of a public-opinion poll. This is an issue of the utmost gravity, and can only be resolved—if the occasion for it arises—by Congress and by our Chief Executive.

Question. Include all suggestions you may have that President Eisenhower should discuss at the forthcoming Big Four meeting concerning all of the captive countries.

Answer. In reply to this question, I wish to call to your attention the enclosed copy of the remarks which I have recently made on the floor of the House, urging the President to exert every effort during the forthcoming Big Four meeting to secure the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

In addition, I would like to mention that I have joined with other Members of Congress in urging the President to discuss, during the conference, the possibility of initiating an exchange of visitors between the free world and Communist-dominated nations. Such an exchange of people and of views could greatly help in lessening the tensions presently existing in the world.

## Irresponsible Criticism of Social Security

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from Mr. Carl P. Miller, president, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in which Mr. Miller purports to speak for the membership of his organization in opposition to the social-security system.

The tenor of Mr. Miller's observations on social security are set forth in the first paragraph of his letter which reads as follows:

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has consistently withheld endorsement of the social-security system, and has, in the past, opposed broadened coverage, liberalized benefits, and a widened tax base. We are deeply concerned over fundamental defects of the system and the philosophy on which it rests.

Mr. Speaker, I view with some concern such attacks on social security based on unfounded and false grounds. The reactionary opposition to the system that has existed since the inception of the program has continually resorted to misinformation and unwarranted criticism in a futile attempt to defeat a program that 20 years of experience and careful actuarial study have proved is sound.

Because I doubt that Mr. Miller was expressing the views of all the members of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in his letter and because I believe the time to set the record straight is long past, I answered Mr. Miller at some length.

I am, Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD inserting my reply to Mr. Miller



and the text of Mr. Miller's letter to me for the information of any interested persons:

AUGUST 1, 1955.

MR. CARL P. MILLER,  
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I have your letter of July 14 in which you once again attack the fundamental concept and philosophy of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. Your letter repeats the absolutely false statements you previously have made regarding this great humanitarian endeavor.

It is positively incredible that you and the great business organization for which you presume to speak still do not accept the basic tenets of social security. Millions upon millions of people, young and old alike, look upon this great program as the solid rock upon which they can fasten their hopes for the future; yet the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce views it as fundamentally defective and philosophically unsound.

You are entitled, of course, to express your opinion regarding social security. However, I call your attention to the fact that even the Republican Party, including some of the most reactionary of the Old Guard elements, has at last recognized in the social security system a sound program that is not only good, but is here to stay. President Eisenhower made this quite clear in a message to Congress in 1954 in which he described the old-age and survivors insurance system as "the cornerstone of the Government's programs to promote the economic security of the individual." The President further stated: "The system is not intended as a substitute for private savings, pension plans, and insurance protection. It is, rather, intended as the foundation upon which these other forms of protection can be soundly built. Thus the individual's own work, his planning, and his thrift will bring him a higher standard of living upon his retirement, or his family a higher standard of living in the event of his death, than would otherwise be the case. Hence the system both encourages thrift and self-reliance, and helps prevent destitution in our national life. In offering, as I here do, certain measures for the expansion and improvement of this system, I am determined to preserve its basic principles. The two most important are: (1) It is a contributory system, with both the worker and his employer making payments during the years of active work; (2) the benefits received are related in part to the individual's earnings. To these sound principles our system owes much of its wide national acceptance."

I trust that your constantly repeated criticism of this program will be to no avail. I assure you that I shall do everything within my power to see that social security continues to serve the great humanitarian purpose for which it was designed. It is operated at an administrative cost ratio of 2 1/4 percent (far less than that of any private insurance company) and provides protection against loss of income due to old age or premature death to 90 percent of the workers in this country, including not only employees but self-employed persons such as farmers, small-business men, and professional groups—7 1/2 million elderly persons, widows, and orphans already are drawing monthly benefits (600,000 in the State of California). These benefits are coming not from the general revenue fund created by the taxpayers, but from the trust fund to which the self-employed and employees and employers alike have contributed.

I have served on the Committee on Ways and Means for 9 years. I participated in extensive hearings conducted by our committee for almost 6 months in 1949, during which many of these ridiculous charges were made and successfully refuted. I participated again in the consideration of the social

security amendments of 1952. Once again, in 1954, I participated in consideration of social security amendments, and in 1955 I played a part in the formulation of H. R. 7225, which, incidentally, was approved not only by the majority but by all but four of the minority members. As a result of these many years of study of the subject I am convinced, as are most Americans, that the OSAI system is sound. As a Democrat, I share the belief that improvements in the coverage and benefits of the system can be made without impairing its soundness. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce is completely out of step with the times in being against social security.

As I have said, you are entitled to continue your opposition to social security, futile and misguided as it is. But I maintain you have no right to spread the fallacy that this great social insurance system is unsound financially. The facts on this are readily available to you, as they are to any American who is broadminded enough to seek the truth. Actuarial estimates presented to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, of which I am proud to be a member, and to the Senate Committee on Finance, show that the contribution rates now in the law make the system wholly self-supporting. These actuarial estimates do not take into account the probability of a continuing rise in wage levels as has occurred throughout all American history. An increase in wage levels would have the effect of increasing income in relationship to outgo in the future.

There similarly is no excuse for your repeated fallacious assertion that there is no real reserve fund. This misstatement has been refuted time and again by such authorities as the American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, the National Association of Life Underwriters, the Advisory Council to the Senate Committee on Finance of 1938, the Advisory Council to the Senate Committee on Finance of 1948 (appointed by the Republican chairman of the committee, Senator MILLIKIN), and more recently by the Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey. Secretary Humphrey has specifically endorsed the investment of the reserve trust fund in Government bonds, saying "I'm sure it's a good way, and in fact I think it's the only way to do it." (NBC television program Meet the Press of May 24, 1953, and pp. 18, 19, and 20 of the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill for 1955.)

The bonds in the trust fund, like all other United States Government bonds, represent the safest investment in the world. In fact, they are the only practicable investment for the funds of the program. In this connection I hope that you and your colleagues will study carefully the section on Reality of the Trust Fund in the enclosed copy of the 15th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which was signed by George M. Humphrey, the present Secretary of the Treasury and a former businessman. This report completely repudiates your contention. (S. Doc. No. 39, 84th Cong., pp. 7-9.)

The charge that benefits and contributions are badly out of balance usually rests on illustrations that in individual cases the value of the benefits paid may greatly outweigh the value of the individual's contributions, or even of those paid by him and by his employer in his behalf. It is, of course, true that for individuals near retirement age in the early years of the program, and for workers with large families, the value of the benefits paid may greatly exceed the value of the contributions. I'm sure you know that this is so, also, in retirement plans established by private industry. If it were not so in OSAI, the program could not be effective

in preventing need, and in relieving the general taxpayers of much of the burden of support of the aged and widows and orphans for many years. In general, the payment of benefits in excess of the contributions received in individual cases is possible because workers who are now young, and who will contribute to the program over most of their working lifetimes, will as a group very nearly pay for their benefits out of their own contributions. The contributions paid by employers with respect to their wages can therefore be used in large measure to finance the excess of the benefits paid to workers now old and those with large families.

I am proud to say that the Ways and Means Committee, in its consideration of social security, has always taken the position that the benefits provided should be based on a sound system of financing. In the words of the committee report on H. R. 7225, "Your committee has always very strongly believed that the system should be actuarially sound. Your committee continues to believe that the tax schedule in the law should make the system self-supporting as nearly as can be foreseen, or in other words, actuarially sound."

In 1955, as in all previous years, the committee was very careful to provide adequate financing for the new benefits provided. Actuarial testimony presented to the committee indicated that the system would be actuarially sound if the contribution rate was increased beginning with January 1, 1957. The committee nevertheless concluded that in order to be absolutely certain of the fund's actuarial soundness the increase in the rate should go into effect on January 1, 1956. As stated in the committee report on the bill, "the old-age and survivors insurance program as amended by this bill would be actuarially sound, and in fact its actuarial status would be improved since the cost of the liberalized benefits is more than met by the increased contributions scheduled (with such rise going fully into effect immediately with the inauguration of the new benefit provision)."

Since the contribution rates are being increased to pay for the additional protection, your statement is not true that funds committed to pay for the protection already provided are being diverted to another purpose.

With regard to your criticism of the current plan to provide benefits to the totally and permanently disabled and to reduce the retirement age for women from 65 to 62, my reaction is this: You have consistently opposed social security; it is to be expected that you would oppose any improvements. I predict that despite your opposition these improvements will be enacted into law next year, the House of Representatives having already approved them.

I realize that this letter will not alter your attitude with respect to social security; you will continue to preach your philosophy of "ragged individualism"; you will continue to argue that, as a wry humorist put it, everyone should be permitted to work out his own destitution. I must demand, however, that you desist in making false and misleading statements, which can only have the effect of causing needless worry for thousands of present and future beneficiaries of this great and beneficent law.

In my opinion the OSAI system is specifically designed to prevent the kind of dependency and loss of initiative you fear. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce doesn't seem to recognize the facts of life that the social-security program helps to preserve our system of individual initiative. In this connection I would like to quote the findings of the Ways and Means Committee in 1949 as expressed in its report on the bill which became the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950:

"The time has come to reaffirm the basic principle that a contributory system of social insurance in which workers share di-

rectly in meeting the cost of the protection afforded is the most satisfactory way of preventing dependency. A contributory system, in which both contributions and benefits are directly related to the individual's own productive efforts, prevents insecurity while preserving self-reliance and initiative.

"Under social insurance, benefits are computed individually in each case, on the basis of earnings in covered employment. Because benefits are related to average earnings and hence reflect the standard of living which an individual has achieved, ambition and effort are rewarded; since they are also related to length of service in covered work, individual productivity is encouraged and the Nation's total production is increased.

"Because benefits under the insurance system are paid as a matter of right following cessation of substantial covered employment, the worker's dignity and independence are preserved."

The mistaken charge that OASI is not an insurance program generally rests on either the fact that there is no contract involved or the fact that there are differences between OASI and individually purchased private insurance. To conclude from this, however, that OASI is not insurance is not sound. It fails to take into account, for example, the basic similarities between old-age and survivors insurance and private group insurance. It ignores the facts that the social-security insurance system, like other insurance systems, is a means of pooling risks; that the risks covered—loss of family income at death, retirement between the ages of 65 and 72, and attainment of age 72—are insurable; that, just as in group insurance, contributions are made by workers and employers and that they are made regularly and beforehand; that there is a definite overall relation between contributions and benefits.

I am convinced that the changes provided in H. R. 7225 are sound and desirable. I am proud to have been a member of the committee which saw the need for this additional protection and took steps to provide it. I am proud to have helped improve the social-security benefits for millions of persons. I hope that this explanation of the real facts about the program will persuade the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce to reexamine the provisions of H. R. 7225 and to endorse the bill. There are many Americans in the Los Angeles area who will benefit by the bill. I hope the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce will see the light and try to support measures for the betterment of our senior citizens of Los Angeles.

Since I have little confidence that you will actually cease presenting these falsehoods to the public, I am having this exchange of correspondence inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It then will be a public record for one and all to see—an unpleasant monument to what should be a great organization.

Sincerely yours,

Cecil R. King.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
July 14, 1955.

HON. CECIL R. KING,  
Member of Congress, Representative,  
17th District, California, House  
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has consistently withheld endorsement of the social-security system and has, in the past, opposed broadened coverage, liberalized benefits, and a widened tax base. We are deeply concerned over fundamental defects of the system and the philosophy on which it rests.

It is our opinion that the responsibility to provide for future personal needs rests primarily with the individual. This concept must be constantly fostered if the individual is not to become more dependent upon the

Federal Government to solve all his problems—a trend which we believe could lead to the destruction of our tradition of individual initiative.

In addition, the entire social-security structure is based on unrealistic financial concepts. Major defects of the system are summarized as follows: OASI is not an insurance program; there is no real reserve fund and no program for protecting future excess income; benefits and contributions are badly out of balance, and future costs are sure to rise sharply.

With respect to the proposals under consideration which would broaden coverage, lower the benefit age for women, and add coverage for permanently and totally disabled workers, we wish to point out our belief that broadened coverage and heavier benefit commitments are dangerous and could well be disastrous to the system. Lowering the benefit age for women would result in unanticipated cost increases and, therefore, less adequate benefits for those in need. While we are sympathetic with the plight of disabled persons, we believe it would be wrong to divert to this purpose social security tax revenues and trust funds which have been collected for and previously committed to old-age benefits.

These changes would compel Congress to increase taxes on the productive workers and employers in order to protect the benefits now being paid to some 7 million individuals, as well as the many millions who look forward hopefully to receiving social-security benefits in their old age.

We believe sincerely that coverage and benefits should not be further liberalized until the commitments and implications involved are fully understood by all. We respectfully urge your opposition to these broadening amendments.

Sincerely yours,

CARL P. MILLER,  
President.

### The President Should Appoint a Special Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange Now Because the Idea War Needs More Firepower—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the brilliant speech made by Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, at the Hotel Pierre, New York City, on June 30, 1955, at a meeting of the Advertising Council's board of directors and guests.

Mr. Repplier recently returned to this country after a 6 months' study of United States information and propaganda methods in the Orient, the Near East, and Europe under the auspices of the Eisenhower exchange fellowships. He is the first non-Government American to study our information activities abroad.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Repplier as a result of his study was that our propaganda offensive needs to sharpen its ideas. Also, we need to draw into our propaganda program more of the skills and talents of America. Mr.

Repplier is convinced that no group of professional propagandists, however able, can project a true image of the country, at an art exhibit, a trade fair, or anywhere else. "In America, we have private organizations—from the Philadelphia Symphony to the Advertising Council—whose weight must be added to the idea war," declares Mr. Repplier. I agree with him completely.

We can win the cold war. But we cannot win it in a walk. It is time we started running. As Mr. Repplier says:

The idea war needs more firepower. We are terribly outgunned. We now spend less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our military budget on propaganda. How can we possibly expect that truth can triumph over falsehood with that sort of niggardliness? The propaganda appropriation should be greatly increased.

In a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, urged the expenditure of up to \$3 billion a year for the kind of propaganda offensive which Mr. Repplier has in mind. And, in an historic speech at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., said that our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected. He pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries—

Sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

The U. S. S. R. not only subsidizes its theater, music, and other cultural programs but it has spent nearly \$2 billion on international theater exchange alone since the end of World War II. While other countries subsidize the arts the United States imposes discriminatory and burdensome taxes on our cultural programs.

Sending our artists abroad for the sole purpose of selling American culture and combating the Russian propaganda offensive has been decried by our cultural leaders who have urged, instead, the sharing of our cultural heritage with other countries. The growing recognition by Mr. Repplier and others of the great contribution which the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra and other leading groups and individuals in the cultural arts field can make in winning friends and allies for our country is heartening indeed. Perhaps this heralds a new period in our history when the poet, the dramatist, the painter, and the musician will be recognized as being as important to our civilization as the engineer and the scientist.

In his message on the state of the Union last January President Eisenhower said that—

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural



activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

The 84th Congress has taken more interest in the cultural arts than any previous Congress in our history. It appropriated \$5 million for the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. Through this new fund we have participated in some 15 trade fairs. We have also sent abroad such things as the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, the Symphony of the Air, the New York City Ballet, *Porgy and Bess*, and many individual artists. These have achieved results out of all proportion to the amount of money involved. Senator WILEY and I led the fight in the Congress for the continuation of this fund in which the President is so vitally interested. The Congress also established a 21-member commission to plan for a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital when it adopted Public Law 128.

The Congress also held hearings on H. R. 6874 and some 15 related bills which would, among other things, carry out the President's recommendations in the cultural field and make the President's Emergency Fund activities a permanent part of the armament of this country in this cold war period. It is expected that this legislation will be enacted into law early in the 2d session of the present Congress.

As a result of these concrete steps the conception held abroad in almost every country that the United States is undoubtedly a fabulously wealthy nation but that it lacks any of the cultural aspects of a great nation is rapidly disappearing. That this misconception has lasted so long has been our own fault, for until this year we have done little or nothing to put an end to it.

The New York Times of August 1 carried a signed article by Harrison E. Salisbury reporting that the State Department is preparing special facilities for handling the anticipated two-way expansion of cultural, scientific, and social contacts with Russia and her satellites. Five Republican and four Democratic Members of the House joined with me on July 7 in urging that President Eisenhower gave serious consideration to discussing exchange visits between the United States and the Soviet Union at the Big Four Conference in Geneva. Earlier Senator KARL E. MUNDT had made the same suggestion to the President. President Eisenhower wrote me on July 11, 1955, that—

When Senator MUNDT made this suggestion to me a few days ago, I assured him that we would give the proposal our earnest consideration. To you and your colleagues I gladly give the same assurance, and am grateful to each of you for giving me your thoughts on this important matter.

It is my earnest hope that the President will take the initiative and appoint immediately the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange which he discussed in his message on the state of the Union on January 6 of this year. Such a special Commission would be of incalculable assistance to the

Federal Government and to the Department of State in the two-way expansion of cultural, scientific, and social contacts with other countries which is now developing. This expansion of cultural interchange was the most important thing that came out of the Geneva Conference. Every step that will assist this expansion of cultural interchange to grow as it must should be taken at this time. Leaders in the fields of the cultural arts would undoubtedly make a significant contribution to this expansion and should be appointed to a special Presidential Commission so that full advantage can be taken of their special abilities, knowledge, and skills. Scientific leaders and representatives of the Advertising Council should also be members of such a special Commission on the arts and cultural interchange. With leaders like General Sarnoff and William Randolph Hearst, Jr., calling for the establishment of a planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence now is the time to take bold action in this field. Delay can only imperil a unique opportunity for securing a significant advantage to our side in this cold war.

I include here the report by Theodore S. Repplier which may well prove to be a turning point in national recognition of the important contributions the arts can make in our relations with foreign countries. I also include a short report from the New York Times on a meeting of cultural leaders held in New York City on April 19, 1955.

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1955]  
UNITED STATES POLICY SCORED ON ART MIS-  
SIONS—SELLING CULTURE DEcriED BY PER-  
FORMERS AND ANTA AID—HERITAGE SHARING  
URGED

Sending performing artists abroad for the sole purpose of selling American culture and combating propaganda was decried here yesterday.

Such performances should be promoted rather to share our cultural heritage with others and to show samples of our talent, speakers said at a luncheon at the Women's City Club, 277 Park Avenue, on the assets and drawbacks of Federal subsidies for the arts.

The speakers were Blanche Yurka, actress; Isaac Stern, violinist; and Robert Schnitzer, general manager of the international exchange program of the American National Theater and Academy.

Asserting that a Government subsidy does not, as many fear, lead to Government control, Mr. Schnitzer described the independence of the French Comédie Française, and the Arts Council of Great Britain. He added that the judging panels of music, drama, and dance of ANTA, which chose those artists to go abroad under State Department subsidy, had not been coerced in any of their decisions.

Mr. Stern said that any pressure arising from Government subsidies would probably never exceed that kind of influence exerted by members of the boards of symphonic orchestras or opera companies.

"The era of great individual support for wealthy institutions is just about over and consequently the broad base of support has increased," Mr. Stern said. "We now look for a thousand persons to contribute \$10 rather than one to give it all."

Discounting the merit of sending artists abroad to combat the effective efforts of another country, Mr. Stern suggested that art

be used as a common meeting ground. The universal rapprochement of individuals in their sharing of art does not exclude the artist or place him above politics, Mr. Stern said. The artist, he observed, is automatically enmeshed in the international conflicts and tensions and must, therefore, accept his responsibility in understanding them.

The establishment of a Government-subsidized theater would come if the Government was convinced that the theater was as important as museums and libraries, Miss Yurka declared.

Only a few persons in the last 10 years have been able to produce good plays without taking personal losses, she said. The financial drawbacks invariably oblige backers to invest in lesser works that border on the trivial.

"If we could persuade our Government that the theater is as important as museums or libraries, we would have a new and vibrant intellectual life," she added.

A national theater should start with a chain of traveling companies that would reach those sections of the United States not visited by existing road companies, Miss Yurka proposed, adding that traveling groups might later be replaced by subsidized theater chains.

#### TRANSCRIPT OF REPORT ON UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA OVERSEAS

(By Theodore S. Repplier, president, the Advertising Council, June 30, 1955)

Directors of the council and friends, I think the first thing I should tell you is that in the far corners of the world, for the past 6 months, come around 8 or 9 o'clock (because we continentals dine late), a toast has been regularly drunk to the Eisenhower exchange fellowship and board of directors of the Advertising Council.

Actually, I think I have returned just about the most grateful traveler since the invention of the nylon shirt. I am tremendously grateful to the Eisenhower exchange fellowship, and to the council for making this trip possible. I hope that some benefit will accrue to both organizations.

I think the best thing I can do, since it would probably be an undue burden to drag you screaming around the world in 30 minutes—you might emerge somewhat bruised—is to restrict this talk mostly to whatever I can tell you about Asia.

#### JAPAN

We left home the first of January 1955 and flew directly to Japan. We were fortunate to arrive at the time of the New Year's season, which apparently lasts in Japan from the 1st of January to about the 20th.

At this time we had a chance to see the famous Japanese courtesy in full swing. When a Japanese meets a friend he hasn't seen since the first of the year, he bows, and I mean really bows—a right-angle bow—and wishes him a very happy New Year. Whereupon his friend, Mr. B, also bows at right angles and returns the greeting. Thereupon Mr. A says that the chief joy of his life during the past year has been Mr. B's friendship. Mr. B then bows and says that his friendship is as nothing compared with Mr. A's. Then Mr. A bows again and says he hopes that in the coming year, Mr. B will continue to honor him with his respected friendship. This goes on for a period of 4 or 5 minutes. For the first several weeks I was there, I began to think the entire Japanese nation lived in a right-angle position.

I think the first thing a propagandist needs to do on arriving in a strange country is learn something about the people, something about their basic character in order to get himself oriented so he will be able to draw a few conclusions.

You notice at once that the Japanese are a very industrious people. Both officework-

ers and the people in the country work terrifically long hours and seem to stop only long enough to get a few hours' sleep.

Japan also has an enormously paternalistic society. This paternalism goes to fantastic lengths. For example, the president of a large Japanese corporation actually gets a very small salary. But his house is usually provided by his company and a company car and chauffeur pick him up every morning. He gets a large expense account for entertainment. And, every so often, the company comes around and says, "Look, George, it's about time you got a new suit." When he is sick, his company takes care of him, and when he dies, his company buries him.

Excess employees are kept on the payroll even when the company is in the red. A firm will borrow money from the bank repeatedly rather than discharge anyone.

This paternalistic psychology is a part of the Japanese code, and takes a little special understanding on our part.

The most remarkable characteristic of the Japanese is, I think, their immense sense of responsibility, known as "on." A Japanese is born with an "on" to many people, and as he grows up, he acquires more and more "ons." In fact, there is a phrase: "So-and-so is my 'on' man" which means you have an obligation to him. You have obligations to teachers who have been particularly helpful to you, certainly to your parents, to the Emperor—though less so now than before—and so on.

The worst thing, perhaps, that you as an American could do in Japan would be, say, to rescue a stranger's hat from rolling under a car because the Japanese would then be under an obligation to you. Since you are a stranger and he can't pay the obligation off, he would have to stagger along under this debt.

It is significant that the word in Japanese for "thank you" is "arigato" which literally means "Oh, this difficult thing"—a reflection of an obligation. It is this extreme sense of duty which has led Japanese to plunge knives into their stomachs for generations, when they feel they have failed in their duty.

And, of course, the Japanese are a people who respect strength and authority, power and discipline.

As to what's going on in Japan—I think many of the changes taking place there at present are social changes.

For example, America's popular music has become popular in Japan as it has around the world. This means that the Japanese now occasionally go dancing with their wives, which is a staggering revolution in Japanese society. Men never did any such thing before; the wives always stayed meekly at home. The whole social system is changing.

Insofar as our propaganda in Japan is concerned, I think it has in the main, been quite successful. One of the things I tried to do in the course of this investigation was to interview anyone who I felt might have a useful opinion. I realized that I could have no valid opinions of my own on such a brief stay, and, therefore, that the best thing I could do was to become a collector of the observations of wiser men.

I soon found the American newspaper and radio correspondents around the world are a highly intelligent, well-informed group. They frequently know much more than the official crowd, they are trained observers, and they usually have valid opinions on political topics. I talked to many of them.

However, it seemed to me that their evaluation of our American propaganda program—and they all had a relatively poor or indifferent opinion of it—was not valid. I felt they were judging it on a wrong basis, and I believe this accounts for most of the criticism of the propaganda program which is given by returning tourists and other travelers.

Either consciously or unconsciously, both resident Americans and travelers tend to

judge the success of the program by how well Americans are liked in a country. If America is liked, something else usually gets the credit. But if America is disliked, it is always because our propaganda program is a failure. To my mind, this is a completely wrong process of reasoning.

I soon came to the conclusion, which I am sure all of you have reached, that it is an absolute absurdity to try to buy love with propaganda. No amount of money is ever going to succeed in doing that, nor is it fair to American taxpayers to expect it to.

This misconception about the object of our propaganda accounts for much of the criticism of the propaganda program which you hear in many places.

Another thing which accounts for it is that the average person has no way, really, to judge it. He gets a few fragmentary indications, and from these, leaps to a conclusion which is almost inevitably wrong.

For example, he decides that in Japan the Voice of America doesn't come in very well. He listened to it once or his local manager listened to it once, and if it didn't say what he felt it ought to have been saying—maybe it was playing some music—the whole thing, therefore, was no good.

I don't think the average person can form a true evaluation of the program. It is somewhat like an iceberg; there's more under the surface than can be seen. For example, considerable of the material that gets into the Japanese newspapers originates with the United States Information Service. It comes over the wireless file, and eventually appeals to an editor who picks it up and uses it. But people who read these stories do not connect them with USIS; there is nothing which indicates the connection.

I believe that the only test of our propaganda program, the only sensible basis of judging it, is: Is it helping to win the cold war? Certainly the supreme fact of our time is that we are engaged in a gigantic struggle, with one half of the world against the other. We are staging a considerable propaganda program, although it is only a fraction of what it should be, and the only possible excuse for it is that we are in a crisis and are trying to use this instrument to help get us out of it.

With that test in mind, which I satisfied myself fairly early in the game was valid, and which I believe is also the sense of the Presidential directive on this subject, I feel we are doing pretty well in Japan.

Actually, the percentage of Communists in Japan is quite low, according to a poll taken while I was there which asked: What do you believe in, which party do you favor, and so on? Communists and left-wing Socialists together amounted to less than 5 percent.

Now this, I think, is quite an achievement in an area where the standard of living is very low, and where life is pretty grim for the majority of the people. Despite its newness as a democracy, Japan has been kept safely in the free-world column.

I believe myself that in Japan the propaganda problem is really inside the economic problem. The supreme facts in Japan are economic ones.

Japan numbers 87 million people in an area the size of California. They can raise only 80 percent of their foodstuffs. They have to import most of their raw materials, including cotton, from high-wage countries, and they sell mostly to low-wage countries. It is true that they have cut down very considerably on their unfavorable balance of trade, and it isn't a hopeless situation.

But I came away feeling that if they succeeded in solving their economic problems, we really don't have anything much to worry about in Japan.

From a propaganda standpoint, there are only two things that particularly disturb me there. As Ted Streibert (Chief, United States Information Service) perhaps will remember, I recommended that we should

step up our work on two groups: labor and the intellectuals. Neither phase is good in Japan. The majority of the unions belong to a Communist federation called SOHYO. There is also an anti-Communist federation called ZENRO which has a smaller number of unions. And there is a body of unions which is sitting on the fence. I think we ought to go strongly to work on the fence sitters.

The other situation which bothered me was the extent to which the intellectuals are still what an old Japanese friend of mine calls "mystical Marxists." Although many of them are not actual Communists, they are very close to it.

The largest Communist bookstore in Tokyo is right opposite Meiji University, and this follows a typical pattern. The Communists try to infiltrate the intelligentsia, usually with considerable success. They do the same thing with labor. They capture student bodies and use them as agitators. They infiltrate the organs of public opinion. The pattern is now fairly well known to us.

But on balance, I would say that we have done pretty well in Japan. The biggest hurdle of our propaganda program has been the achievement of practical things. One of these was to get the Japanese to agree to rearm. There was a tremendous pacifist sentiment in Japan at one point, and it took a good deal of hard work to bring the Japanese around to agreeing to rearm. However, a good job has been done there.

## The President Should Appoint a Special Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange Now Because the Idea War Needs More Firepower—II

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the concluding portion of a historic report made by Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, of a 6 months' study of United States information and propaganda methods in the Orient, the Near East, and Europe under the auspices of the Eisenhower exchange fellowships:

#### HONGKONG

We are going to jump now to Hongkong, down in southern China. The principal value of Hongkong is that it is a listening post for Communist China. Communist China is about 15 miles up the Kowloon Peninsula. You sit at the bottom of this peninsula, with the island of Hongkong, a mountainous island, before you, and this purple water in between, and it is hard to believe that Red China is breathing down your neck.

Everybody in Hongkong knows that he is living on borrowed time. Everybody knows that the Communists could take the crown colony any Friday evening if they wanted to. But that doesn't prevent Hongkong from having a tremendous boom. Capital is flowing in there at a great rate. It is mostly scared money coming from Chinese merchants in other areas. It is a rather ironic commentary that Chinese merchants from Singapore and Indonesia are investing their money in Hongkong, which is 15 miles away from the Communist zone.



New docks are being built in Hongkong. Big new buildings are being built. Everybody is acting as though the situation were completely normal even though everybody realizes that it is going to end someday with a bang. The moment it becomes disadvantageous to the Communists to permit this little free island in the great land mass of Communist China to remain, it will disappear overnight.

#### COMMUNIST CHINA

As far as I can find out, Communist China is making real progress, and this, I think, is the most alarming fact of Southeast Asia.

Actually, there have been a great many minor revolts. At one time, inside of China, anyone who had his window open was arrested, because it was assumed that he was going to jump out. And the executions have been terrific. There have been the usual police state methods of whipping people into line, but insofar as I can tell, they have been successfully whipped into line. Apparently the Communists are convincing the majority of the people that this is a revolution which is beneficial to China.

A great many people from other Asian countries go in and out of China, and over in the Southeast Asia area you read a lot more about what's going on in China than you do here. I read a series of articles in the Illustrated Weekly of India, which is certainly no Communist paper, by an Indian named Jain who had just been in China.

This is a quote from it: "Through press, radio, movies, dance, drama, billboards, wall posters, and, indeed, through every conceivable means of mass communication, a single idea has spread. It is that a long, gloomy chapter in China's history filled with stories of a few exploiting the millions, of foreigners exploiting the nation, and poverty and filth, has ended, and a new one has begun, bespeaking an era when there will be no exploitation of man by man, and each person will get his due share."

Well, this sort of incessant propaganda is, of course, most effective, as I had a chance to see over in the East Zone in Berlin behind the Iron Curtain. You are exposed to propaganda on every side. You cannot go a block without seeing large streamers carrying slogans and messages. It is extensive and never ceasing, and it is bound to have an effect.

So I think that China is going to be a power to be reckoned with in Southeast Asia, and this seems to me a fact we should not forget.

There is no doubt that the Chinese have been apt pupils. The propaganda which they send out is good. For example, the magazine which they edit on Red China, and which is distributed throughout Southeast Asia, is a creditable publication. It is on good slick paper and is very well done. The Chinese propagandists know what they are doing. They have been going to Red schools since 1932. China is really on the march. This is something we will ignore only at our peril.

#### PHILIPPINES, SINGAPORE, LAOS, CAMBODIA

Down in the Philippines things are pretty well in hand, and a most effective job has been done in which the United States Information Service has played an important part.

Down in Singapore, where 80 percent of the population is Chinese, as are many of the populations of Southeast Asia, the people are constantly subjected to a drumfire of propaganda from Red China. The result is widespread disaffection among the Chinese.

Some of the heaviest contributors to the whole Communist movement are the wealthy Chinese merchants. The Chinese are, of course, the merchant class of the Orient, and they are important either from a numerical standpoint or from an influence standpoint in most of the countries of Southeast Asia.

I think it is likely that communism will filter down into some parts of Laos. I don't know how Cambodia is going to go. There

is still a chance that we will hold a part of Indochina. But it's a pretty good guess to assume that there is considerable danger of communism swinging westward toward India.

#### BURMA

That leaves Burma, which is largely an impotent power at the moment. It's a republic and has a very able, idealistic Prime Minister. But he is surrounded by a bunch of politicians and he has a hard job. His country is constantly subjected to the activities of Communist bands who delight in putting dynamite on the railroad tracks, and coming down into the teak forests, killing the elephants and stealing the teakwood. He needs a really good army to help him as General Templer, the British general, had in Malaya. But he hasn't got much of an army and he's having a difficult time. He sits at the bottom of that particular end of the continent with solid Communist territory north of him to the Arctic Circle.

#### INDIA

Now we come to India. I would like to add something to your understanding of the Indian problem in Asia because I think it is so terribly important.

The leading authority on this part of the world is Professor Brown, who, I think, has done the best book on this subject. It is called *United States, India, and Pakistan*, published by the Harvard University Press. He says that there are less than a hundred people in the United States who are really expert on one phase or another of this whole area.

I agree with his belief that lack of knowledge of the Asian opinion, and lack of sympathy with Asians brought about the downfall of the British Empire there.

India consists, as you know, of a land mass of over a million square miles. It has a population close to 400 million. It is largely flat with mountains mainly in the north.

India won its independence in 1947 after a long struggle during which its leaders made martyrs of themselves, going to jail for periods of up to 10 years—which is one up on George Washington.

The Indian Independence Act was passed about 30 days ahead of the actual date on which India won its independence. A month after that notice, 28,000 British civil servants walked out of India, leaving only about 500 Indians who were in any way trained to govern this vast subcontinent.

They found themselves with a country which was probably the most divided of any on record. There were then about 450 separate states in India. There were 25 different languages spoken. There were 5 separate castes and 2,000 subdivisions of these castes. The Hindus and Moslems were at each other's throats, and there was endless bloodshed and civil war.

All in all, if ever there was a country ripe for dictatorship, it was India. But it had the courage to become a democracy.

This is a remarkable thing when you consider that most of the countries of the world newly freed from colonialism haven't dared to give their people the franchise. India is 85 percent illiterate, yet it gave its citizens the vote.

India's constitution starts with "We, the people." And most of India's people can't even read.

This resulted in a curious situation at the first election. The symbol of the Congress Party—Nehru's party and the leading party of India—is a pair of yoked bullocks. Many persons voted for this symbol because they reasoned: The bullock helps me with my work; therefore I will vote for the bullock.

Despite all obstacles, India has carried on as a democracy. It has probably made the boldest plans of any country in the world. A commission was established to draw up the first 5-year plan. It surveyed the landscape and decided that the primary job was

to grow more food with the secondary job one of improving the transport. Some \$140 million was appropriated to try to accomplish these ends.

Now 85 percent of the people of India live in about 550,000 Indian villages. These villages are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country. Consequently, if anything were going to be done, the improvements had to start with these villages.

The villagers live in a state which is impossible to imagine unless you have visited them. They live in mud huts, their streets are not paved, and they are surrounded by dirt and squalor. Women wander up and down collecting camel dung and making it into large pats which are put on the sides of the walls to dry. This becomes their principal fuel. By and large, things in the villages are pretty much as they were back in Biblical times.

Nevertheless, the thing which really typifies India is the city of Chandigar, the new capital of the Punjab, which is probably the most modern city in the world. Le Corbusier, the famous French architect, headed up its construction, and it looks almost freakishly modern rising up from the plains, with mud huts to the right and left of it.

I think, the net net of India is that it is trying to compress about 2,000 years into 50 and has made enormous progress at it. About 19 huge dams are being built, the biggest of which would make our TVA look small. A network of canals is being constructed, and most importantly, men are being trained, with the aid of the Ford Foundation, as "gram Sevaks" or "village servants." They are being trained in agriculture, public health, and so on, so that they can go to live in the villages and try to elevate the standard of living.

I walked through one of these villages after some of the improvements had been made and some of the dams had been put into operation. We were met by the village headman and escorted with much ceremony through the village. The inhabitants were terribly proud because they now had a tube well, run by an electric pump. It supplies a steady flow of water which formerly had to be drawn up laboriously by bullocks turning round and round an axis. As a result of the increased water, the people get 3 crops of wheat per year instead of 1.

The streets of this little village, which wind up these mud hills about 8 or 10 feet wide, are being paved with bricks by the villagers on their own time. They put up half the money themselves and the state puts up half, and slowly but surely the village is on the march toward better things.

I think the significant point is that India is the largest democracy in the world in terms of population, and that just to the north of it is the tremendous land mass of China. What really is going on in Asia is a great backward country sweepstakes, and this is the thing that all Asia is watching.

Which way of life can most quickly transform a backward country, and make it into something which gives its people a better break?

The Communists of China have made great headway with the theory: Go Communist and all your troubles will be over. Look at us. We have subdued the black market. We have honest government for the first time in ump-ten years. We are making enormous progress.

This argument carries tremendous weight with Asians because they too are Asians. They are all people of darker skins. Consequently, the influence of India as the democratic entry in the backward country sweepstakes is something we should never underestimate.

I myself feel that, regardless of what Mr. Nehru says, we must never forget that he is sitting virtually unarmed at the bottom of a continent which is Communist to the Arctic Circle. If Mexico were in the same position

and we were inclined to be pugilistic, I fancy it would keep a civil tongue in its head also.

Consequently, I think that when you take what Mr. Nehru does instead of what Mr. Nehru says, you can be quite reassured. He is far from naive about communism. He has disinfected a zone south of Communist China. No foreigners are allowed into it. All traffic into Tibet is very carefully scrutinized for any material which might be of warming value. Inside of India, Nehru fights the Communist Party tooth and nail, and licks it. The Congress party badly defeated the Communists recently in the Andhra elections in the south of India.

So I feel that our propaganda in India needs to say over and over to the Indian peasant, whose life is very grim: Hang on, boys. Help is on the way.

On balance, I think you can add it up like this. In Japan, despite rather grim conditions, we've done better than hold our own. Communism has been kept down to a small percentage of the voters. In the Philippines we really have nothing to worry about at the moment; communism is contained in various pockets there. In the Malay Peninsula and on through to Indochina, it's touch and go. In India, the situation is as I have described, not forgetting that a considerable victory has just been won in the south of India.

Going on to Europe, the principal fact is, I think, that in northern Italy, communism is on the wane. I drove all through the Communist belt in the north. I talked to political leaders and people in all of the Communist-held towns and villages. I think communism has really reached high tide in the north. I don't think it has hit its high-water mark in the south of Italy, and about 15,000 Communist agitators have just been transferred from the north of Italy to the south. But in north Italy, I think we are over the worst of it.

In France, there is no visible decline of Communist voters as yet, but the signs are good. The circulation of the Communist newspaper is down. Their party membership is off, and their long-range outlook is not good.

Well, does that mean we can relax? I don't think so. I think it means merely that we are over the learning period and that we ought really to begin to have at it.

The ominous signs are still many. You cannot even relax in a country like Italy because there are too many factors there that are unsound and unfavorable. Their economic ideas are still not too modern, although they are beginning to show some glimmer about such things as productivity. But as long as you have largely family-owned businesses which want to hang on to everything they have, as long as you have the intermixture of church and politics, as long as you have the Democratic Christian party which is as indecisive and badly split as it is, it would be unwise to grow complacent.

I am going to close with a few observations which I have taken the liberty of writing out.

In hotel rooms around the world I had plenty of time to think about this baffling problem of the idea war in which we are engaged. For what they are worth, here are a few conclusions:

On the positive side, we are making progress. We are over the worst of the learning period, and have profited by our mistakes. Here and there we have developed some excellent field generals in the idea war—men who have some of the skills of advertising and public relations and who also know the host country and its people, and have experience in foreign policy. This is a new breed and we do not have enough of them.

If you take a cold war inventory, country by country around the world I believe our gains at least balance our losses.

There is reason to be encouraged. And yet there is also reason to be alarmed.

In far too many minds throughout the world—and some very important minds—communism is still the white knight and capitalism is still the dragon. Communism is still the wave of the future and capitalism is still the dying way of life.

We in America know it to be the truth that since World War II we have bound up the wounds of the world. Yet millions think of the Soviets as the idealists and the United States as the dollar-mad materialists.

Too often, in too many countries, the situation is looked at in an upside-down mirror by two key groups: labor and the intellectuals.

In short, our propaganda offensive, in my opinion, still has several critical needs.

First, it needs to sharpen its ideas. There still exists an urgent need to make clear that a new economic system has been born—a system which gives more benefits to more people than any yet devised—a system I should like to call people's capitalism. In my view, experts from various disciplines should define the ingredients of this system, and a popular writer should synthesize their conclusions in the free world's "Das Kapital."

Second, we desperately need a crusade. The lack of a crusade could cost us the cold war. To many, the Communists are the champions of the common man. America appears to champion nothing but its own safety. In those areas in which we have failed, I think this largely explains our failure.

Third, the idea war needs more firepower. We are terrible outgunned. We now spend less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our military budget on propaganda. How can we possibly expect that truth can triumph over falsehood with that sort of niggardliness? The propaganda appropriation should be greatly increased.

Fourth, we need to draw into our propaganda program more of the skills and talents of America. No group of professional propagandists, however able, can project a true image of the country, at an art exhibit, a trade fair, or anywhere else. In America, we have private organizations—from the Philadelphia Symphony to the Advertising Council—whose weight must be added to the idea war.

We can win the cold war. But we cannot win it in a walk. It is time we started running.

### **The President Should Appoint a Special Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange Now Because the Idea War Needs More Firepower—III**

#### **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, practically every major country in the world provides some direct aid in the form of subsidy to cultural programs. The United States, on the other hand, imposes discriminatory and burdensome taxes on these programs. This has provided a propaganda bonanza to the Russians who have busily spread the lie that while the United States is a fabulously wealthy nation it lacks any of the cultural aspects of a great nation.

That this misconception has lasted so long has been our own fault, for until recently we have done little or nothing to put an end to it. The Russian Gov-

ernment not only subsidizes its theater, music, and other cultural programs but has spent nearly \$2 billion on international theater exchange alone since the end of World War II, an amount 700 times greater than the \$3 million which the United States has spent on sending our cultural programs abroad.

It is becoming crystal clear that unless we do something concrete to aid our theater we will not have any cultural programs to export. The number of plays and concerts has declined sharply in recent years due to the high costs involved and, particularly, because of burdensome Federal taxes. Studies made by Actors' Equity Association and by Prof. O. Glenn Saxon, Yale University, show the extent of the serious unemployment existing among musicians, actors, and performing artists in general.

We have prided ourselves on having the highest standard of living in the world. In view of this standard of living we should be interested in what repeated surveys in the fields of the cultural arts show.

The 32 major symphony orchestras in the United States and Canada employ fewer than 2,270 musicians. These musicians work an average of only 22.4 weeks per year at an average weekly pay of \$81, and an average annual wage of \$1,814. Not more than 2,200 musicians in the 2,636 radio stations in the United States—less than 1 musician per station—enjoy a full year's employment. Dr. Howard Hanson, president of the National Music Council, testified at hearings held by the 83d Congress that—

There are some patrons of orchestras who prefer to support their orchestras without governmental assistance. They are, of course, entitled to their belief, but I say that in any situation where a skilled performer is guaranteed a \$1,500-a-year salary that orchestra is supported not by philanthropists but by the idealism and devotion of the underpaid musician who serves them.

Over 80 percent of the membership of the American Guild of Musical Artists, the American Federation of Labor national union with collective bargaining and other contractual relations with all the professional opera and ballet companies in the United States as well as with the concert managements who present the concert artists appearing in our country, earn less than \$2,000 a year. This union represents soloists, choristers, dancers, stage directors, stage managers, and choreographers in the fields of opera, dance, ballet, and the concert stage.

The employment picture in the field of the living theater is no better. According to the study made by Professor Saxon, professor of economics at Yale University, on a research grant from the National Theater Arts Council and Theater Arts magazine, the total employment of actors and actresses was only 991 in 1953. This was less than 15 percent of the number employed in the 1927-28 season. The average income of all professional actors and actresses for the 1952-53 season was only \$800 per person. It is clear that incomes like this will purchase little food, shelter, clothing or the other necessities of life. It will hardly buy milk for the baby, let alone



pay for his medical attention. It will certainly buy no Cadillacs, the favorite car in Washington these days.

The gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, and I have, after considering these facts, introduced legislation to repeal the 10-percent tax on concerts and legitimate theater productions. We believe that repeal of the tax is essential to the survival and growth of the living theater and concert stage in America. We believe that this is but one of a number of steps that must be taken to assist the arts in our country. We have introduced in this Congress a number of bills to encourage the growth of the arts in our country including President Eisenhower's bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I include as part of my remarks the text of the bills, H. R. 7609 and H. R. 7851, we have introduced to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax. A short explanation of our bill is also included together with an article by Herman Shumlin, distinguished theater producer, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

A bill to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 4233 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the tax on admissions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) Fine arts program: Any admission to a program the principal part of which consists of—

"(A) a lecture;

"(B) an opera, symphony, ballet, concert, or musical performance;

"(C) a drama or theatrical presentation;

or

"(D) any combination of the foregoing—performed in person within the place of admission. This paragraph shall not apply to an admission to a roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place, or to an admission to which paragraph (1) (C) of this subsection applies."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after the 1st day of the 1st month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act for admission on or after such first day.

MEMORANDUM ON H. R. 7609 (THOMPSON) AND H. R. 7851 (CELLER), BILLS TO EXEMPT FINE ARTS PROGRAMS FROM THE ADMISSIONS TAX

H. R. 7609 (Introduced by Representative THOMPSON of New Jersey) and H. R. 7851 (Introduced by Representative CELLER, of New York) would exempt from the 10 percent admissions tax any admission to a lecture, ballet, opera, or play which is presented in person. It would thus exclude the living theater and musical performances from the existing burdensome taxes.

The urgent need for repeal of the Federal taxes has become apparent in the light of a diminishing number of concerts and plays which are being presented in the country, and the serious condition of unemployment which exists among actors, actresses, musicians and other performing artists. In the field of the legitimate theater, the number of theaters and play productions has declined sharply since the 1920's. This condition has continued and has reached even more acute stages in recent years. In many parts of the country, legitimate theatrical produc-

tions have become a rarity due to the high cost of operations, including the 10 percent Federal tax.

Competition from tax-free television and radio places the living stage at a serious economic disadvantage. The present tax laws unjustly discriminate against live musical and theatrical productions performed in the concert hall or theater.

The number of actors and musicians employed in various segments of the theater, such as musical plays, operas, concerts, and ballet, has continuously declined for the past 20 years. Many members of the actors' and musicians' unions are employed only a few weeks out of the year in their professions. The majority of the performers are forced to supplement their income from noncreative fields in order to maintain a minimum standard of existence.

Certain fine arts programs, such as opera and symphony, have already received sympathetic attention from the Congress in the way of tax relief, but the present exemptions are confined to certain types of charitable organizations receiving funds from public institutions or soliciting contributions from members of the public. The bill recognizes the important fact that there is no proper distinction in the cultural field between programs presented by charitable organizations and other groups. The existing laws unjustly discriminate against those presenting plays and musical productions on a paying basis.

It is reliably estimated that the revenue from admissions taxes on fine arts programs at the present time does not exceed more than \$7 million annually. A reduction in the admissions tax would be more than made up by substantially increased employment of musicians, actors, and others once the heavy burden of the admissions tax is removed.

The present tax on fine arts programs is a serious hindrance and impediment to the element of cultural life in many communities throughout the Nation. The tax is a substantial addition to the already high cost of presenting concerts, lecture programs, and plays. Removal of the tax would be of inestimable benefit to many community projects throughout the country which seek to become established on a paying basis. The increased employment of talented performers will also stimulate creative activity. The ultimate beneficiary, however, will be the American people who would be able to participate more fully in an important phase of cultural life.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

WANTED: OLD-FASHIONED PATRONS OF THE ARTS

(By Herman Shumlin)

(Today's columnist, Mr. Shumlin, is the producer of the drama *Inherit the Wind*. His subject is backers.)

I've got a million words I want to say. What subject should I choose? I could write a piece about my wonderful production, *Inherit the Wind*, and that would be useful to do. I could write a piece about the man I love, Paul Muni. And a piece about Ed Begley, gifted, sincere, clean-hearted Ed Begley. And a piece about the contributions of many, many people to the whole vast mural that is *Inherit the Wind*.

Or I could write something about the modern chautauqua stage, or, as it is now called, the Paul Gregory Theater. I could say something about the hollow impact of walking into a theater with the curtain up and then watching an actor in a tuxedo jacket craftily, cunningly, brilliantly, pick up a stool from one place and put it in another. What lecture hall memories it brings back to me. Isn't it artistic? And just look at all those microphones, hanging, standing, nestled in

the footlights. How honest, how pure it all is. But I don't want to do that, because then I would be acting like a critic, and heaven knows I wouldn't want to do that.

#### A FEW WORDS ON CRITICS

I could do a piece about critics, too, of course, and that is very tempting. I have a lot to say about critics, about the good ones, the able ones, and the others. But then I ask myself if that is not the swift road to trouble. And I answer that it is. And then I ask myself if that should make any difference to me, and I answer that it shouldn't. And it won't. (I have many such interesting conversations with myself.) But not today.

So what I am devoting this column to is this: Backers, and what they are not.

Last night on my way to the National Theater I stepped into a store on 42d Street that sold books for 19 cents. Any book in the store, 19 cents. The best I could come out with was a small book picturing some of the paintings of an early 16th century artist named Cranach. There is a picture of a naked woman with a dagger in her hand on the cover, but that had nothing to do with my buying it, of course.

And that's why I decided to write about backers. For in this little book there is some text which informed me that Cranach, who was born in 1472, got a job in 1505 with the Elector of Saxony, who was called Frederic the Wise.

#### HE WAS A BACKER

Frederic was a backer. He backed Cranach. He also started a university in Saxony, and he hired another fellow, a fellow named Martin Luther. Now, every one knows that Luther got into a peck of trouble. He said a lot of things that a lot of powerful people didn't like. The point about Frederic is that, and I quote: "He never withdrew his protection in spite of the immense difficulties it caused him as time went on." That's what I call a backer.

Down in Florida 2 weeks ago I found a perfectly beautiful library called the Johan Fust Memorial Library. And who was Fust? Well, Fust was the man who backed Gutenberg in his invention of movable type, which in importance is probably only second to the invention of the wheel. And when the experimenting didn't go so well, and Gutenberg quit for one reason or another, Johan Fust carried it through. Fust was a man of finance and a merchant. That's what I call a backer. And no royalties, either.

There used to be a fellow named Otto Kahn. He liked the theater, and he put up hundreds of thousands of dollars for Max Reinhardt's marvelous productions, and for Morris Gest, who produced great big musicals.

There are lots of investors in show business now; there are 49 of them, all very fine folks, in *Inherit the Wind*. Some of them put up their money regardless of the possibility of success, because they liked what the play said. But where are the real backers? The country is full of foundations; foundations for taking care of old sailors; foundations for preserving bird life, printing Bibles, teaching Yoga, helping musicians, sending missionaries to Africa; foundations for anything you can think of.

We have great big art museums and they're fine institutions. But why is it no one ever sets up a foundation for the theater? Will somebody answer that one for me? Americans did put up most of the money for the Shakespeare Theater at Stratford in England. I guess it means more when you do it in England. What art has contributed more than the theater? Does Beethoven come anywhere near Shakespeare? Does Goya?

Why aren't there some real old-fashioned backers in the theater? I don't mean to put up money for a show. I mean to set up, and build, and endow institutions. What art is more living, more meaningful? What

a bang I would get from putting up the cash for a fine theater, the Herman Shumlin Theater, and cash to keep it going forever, nonprofit, a part of the community and national life. What greater joy while I was still alive, and what greater memorial after I have gone?

One fellow has struggled 7 years or so to set up a theater in Connecticut. No one believed he could do it when he started. And the Rockefeller money helped him. Langner is his name: Lawrence Langner. He broke the ice.

Let others emulate the Rockefellers. Let them do even better. Backers, that's what I'd like to see, like the backers of yesterday.

## Mutual Security Appropriation Act

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BARRATT O'HARA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a detailed analysis of Public Law 206, providing appropriations for mutual defense assistance. This was prepared for my study by Elizabeth Elward, American Law Division of the Library of Congress. I think it will prove of value for reference to my colleagues.

The analysis follows:

Public Law 208, 84th Congress

(Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956)

#### MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

<b>Military assistance:</b>	
Appropriation.....	\$705,000,000
Unobligated and unreserved balance.....	33,900,000
<b>Total, military assistance.....</b>	<b>738,900,000</b>
<b>Direct forces support.....</b>	<b>317,200,000</b>
<b>Defense support:</b>	
Europe.....	85,500,000
Near East and Africa.....	113,700,000
<b>Asia:</b>	
Appropriation.....	800,000,000
Unobligated balance.....	25,000,000
<b>Total, Asia.....</b>	<b>825,000,000</b>
<b>Total defense support:</b>	
Appropriation.....	999,200,000
Unobligated balance.....	25,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,024,200,000</b>
<b>Total mutual defense assistance:</b>	
Appropriation.....	2,021,400,000
Unobligated balance.....	58,900,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,080,300,000</b>
<b>DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE</b>	
Near East and Africa.....	\$73,000,000
South Asia.....	51,000,000
American Republics.....	38,000,000
<b>Total, development assistance.....</b>	<b>162,000,000</b>

#### TECHNICAL COOPERATION

General authorization.....	\$127,500,000
United Nations program.....	24,000,000
Organization of American States.....	1,500,000
<b>Total, technical cooperation.....</b>	<b>153,000,000</b>

#### OTHER PROGRAMS

Special Presidential fund.....	\$100,000,000
Special assistance in joint control areas.....	21,000,000
Intergovernmental Committee for European migration: Appropriation.....	12,500,000
United Nations Refugee Fund.....	1,200,000
Escapee program.....	6,000,000
United Nations Children's Fund.....	14,500,000

United Nations Relief and Works Agency:	
Appropriation.....	58,366,750
Unobligated balance.....	3,633,250

<b>Total.....</b>	<b>62,000,000</b>
North Atlantic Treaty Organization.....	3,700,000

<b>Ocean freight charges:</b>	
United States voluntary relief agencies.....	2,000,000
Surplus agricultural commodities.....	13,000,000

<b>Total.....</b>	<b>15,000,000</b>
Control act expenses.....	1,175,000
Administrative expenses.....	33,500,000
President's fund for Asian economic development.....	100,000,000

<b>Total other programs:</b>	
Appropriation.....	366,941,750
Unobligated balance.....	3,633,250

<b>Total.....</b>	<b>370,575,000</b>
-------------------	--------------------

<b>Total, mutual security appropriation.....</b>	<b>2,703,341,750</b>
--	----------------------

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Authorizes the use of funds for (a) rents in the District of Columbia, (b) expenses of attendance at meetings, (c) employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad, (d) maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft, (e) purchase of automobiles, (f) entertainment with in the United States up to \$15,000, (g) exchange of funds, (h) expenditures up to \$50,000 of a confidential character other than entertainment, (i) insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, (j) rental, lease, repair, and alteration of quarters outside of the United States to accommodate Government employees, (k) expense of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons or members of families of persons who may die while participating in activities under the Mutual Security Act or other act directly related to the purposes thereof, (l) purchase of uniforms, (m) employment of chauffeurs, (n) medical examinations of dependents of overseas personnel or candidates for overseas positions on the same basis as for employees or candidates, (o) per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons participating in any program of furnishing technical information and assistance while in countries other than their own and other than the continental United States, (p) expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act, (q) ice and drinking water for use abroad, (r) services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey with certain limitations herein prescribed, (s) travel expenses with certain restrictions herein prescribed.

2. Requires a semiannual report to Congress of engineering fees in excess of \$25,000 to any one firm on any one project.

3. Limits to \$25 million the amount of foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the United States which shall remain available until June 30, 1956, without reimbursement to the Treasury, for liquidation of obligations incurred against such currencies or credits prior to July 1, 1953, pursuant to authority contained in the Mutual Security Act and other acts pursuant to which funds were authorized.

4. Directs that foreign currencies generated under the provisions hereof shall be utilized only for the purposes for which the funds providing the commodities which generated the currency were appropriated.

5. Prohibits the use of funds generated as a result hereof for payments on account of the principal or interest on any debt of any foreign government or on any loans made to such government by any other foreign government.

6. Prohibits the obligation and/or reservation of more than 20 percent of the funds made available hereby during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

7. Makes funds available from July 1, 1955.

8. Requires an accounting of funds allocated to the Department of Defense for military assistance.

9. Continues antistrike provisions.

## He Fights for Conservation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. LEE METCALF**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the current article in the *He Fights for Conservation* series in *Sports Afeld* magazine is devoted to our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

LESTER JOHNSON is a fighter for conservation of land, water, fish, and wildlife. I am pleased to see this well-deserved recognition of his devotion and ability.

The article, by Michael Hudoba, Washington editor of the sportsmen's magazine, follows:

#### HE FIGHTS FOR CONSERVATION

(Eleventh in series of profiles of men in Congress leading fight for vital laws to help sport, conservation)

Representative LESTER JOHNSON, Democrat, from Black River Falls, Wis., has only been in Congress since 1953 but he's working hard for conservation of land, water, fish, and wildlife.

An original member of the growing bipartisan conservation bloc in the House, Representative JOHNSON studies the complex conservation issues, and is right on the frontline in hearings and on the floor when fights for these resources are impending.

He has introduced bills for land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation, and was the first to put in the measure for the multiple-purpose use of national forests to assure that all the public values would be protected and used wisely.

Representative JOHNSON dug deeply into the duck-stamp and waterfowl refuge program to come up with data on what has happened to the sportsmen's duck-stamp dollars. He used these facts in testimony before the House Merchant Marine and



Fisheries Committee on bills to make sure the duck-stamp money was used for its original purpose. He also carried this question to the floor of the House where he spoke at length to bring it into focus for Congress.

## Peace With Prosperity, a Reality

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud that I stand here today as a member of the great Republican administration that has after better than 2½ years lived up to the pledge to give the people peace with prosperity.

We are so prone to forget that the peace we enjoy today did not just happen. It had to be worked for and it will require even harder work to maintain it.

We promised the people 3 years ago to wage peace first and then go to work on building a sound prosperity based on that peace. Today under a Republican administration we enjoy them both simultaneously—something no Democrat administration has ever been able to do.

After ending the fighting in Korea, we seized the initiative for peace with a new foreign policy based on firmness and strength.

We strengthened our collective security throughout the world with membership in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—achieving West German sovereignty and NATO membership; signing of the Austrian peace treaty calling for withdrawal of Soviet troops; we helped solve the Trieste, Suez base, and Iranian-oil problems; supported the defense pacts between Middle East countries; and entered into mutual-assistance agreements with Latin American countries and Panama.

In the last 2 years our Republican administration has built up our defenses at lower cost with greater effectiveness through increased emphasis on airpower and new atomic weapons. We have established an Air Force Academy.

President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace program has been launched. The atomic-energy law has been revised to promote sharing of atomic-energy data with private industry and 27 other friendly nations. The President has appointed a Secretary for Peace with Cabinet status established to plan world disarmament.

Our world trade relations have been improved through genuinely reciprocal agreements. The Trade Agreements Act has been extended and customs rules simplified.

Our Republican administration has accomplished the transition from war to a peace economy without sacrificing prosperity.

The confidence, foresight, and determination of President Eisenhower, and our Republican administration have lifted this Nation's economy to a record-breaking pinnacle of prosperity.

Never before in history have so many people been working, investing, building, and producing. Beginning in 1953, when the American people became certain that an era of good government was at hand, the Nation's progress steadily increased to the historic peak that has been reached in the year 1955.

The future holds greater promise. By taking speedy action in freeing the economy from the shackles of wartime controls, the Republican Party laid a firm, progressive base for the rapid and continuing expansion of the American economy.

Business, industry, and labor alike, despite the outcries of phony doom-predicting political economists, shed their fears of the future when the new administration revealed its realistic program for the good of all the people.

Factory wheels have been set spinning, industries expanding and new businesses booming by the partnership in prosperity created by vast and immediate cuts in Federal spending and waste, by across-the-board tax cuts totaling \$7.4 billion and by the restoration of the people's faith in honest government.

The faith of the American people in our Republican administration is being demonstrated every day. Once unshackled the economy of America responded to the wise leadership that has been available in the Nation since 1953.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration is dedicated to keeping the peace and continuing the progress and prosperity, and I am sure a vast majority of the American people have full confidence in our ability to live up to this pledge.

## "The Catholic Gift to the Public Schools":

Editorial by the Most Reverend John F.

O'Hara, CSC, Archbishop of Philadelphia,

Discusses How Catholics, in Addition

to Their Federal, State, and Local

Tax Payments, Contribute More than \$1

Billion a Year in "Grants" to the Na-

tion's Public Schools

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread interest among Members of Congress in the problems of our schools, and in view of the fact that there is now pending on the calendar of the House a bill for Federal aid to education, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a very important discussion of this matter by a very distinguished constituent of mine, the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, CSC, Archbishop of Philadelphia.

From time to time Archbishop O'Hara has commented editorially in the Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia on some of the broad aspects of the prob-

lems of education. I was pleased and honored to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial of his which appeared in the Catholic Standard and Times earlier this year. I was gratified by the comments of so many of my colleagues in the House who expressed their appreciation to me for having placed this material in the RECORD.

The latest editorial by Archbishop O'Hara on this matter, entitled "The Catholic Gift to the Public Schools," appeared in the Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia on last Friday, July 29. It discussed in detail some facts which are not generally known in connection with what might be called the subsidy—or rather, subsidies—which Catholics in the United States, through the Catholic schools and otherwise, provide for public schools. In this editorial, Archbishop O'Hara places those facts on view in a clear and impressive manner.

CATHOLIC SUBSIDY OF \$52 PER PUPIL IN NORTH-EAST PUBLIC SCHOOLS

For instance, he shows that through the very operation of the Catholic schools, the States of the Northeast are able to spend \$247 per year per pupil in the public schools. If there were no Catholic schools in those States, the same amount of public-school funds would provide only \$195 per pupil. As the archbishop points out, this amounts to a Catholic subsidy of \$52 per pupil per year in the public schools in the Northeast—the States from Maine to Pennsylvania.

For the North Central States—Ohio to Kansas—this subsidy is \$29 per pupil per year. In the West—Rocky Mountains to the Pacific—it is \$17 per pupil in the public schools per year. In the South—Delaware to Oklahoma—it is \$6 per pupil. As the archbishop analyzes these figures, it comes to a total of \$620,692,000 per year in this particular Catholic gift to the public schools.

Another Catholic gift to the public schools, the archbishop declares in this editorial, is in the \$500 million of Catholic school construction per year. The other subsidy referred to school operating costs; this one refers to construction of buildings. If the \$500 million of Catholic school construction were not put into place each year, the same amount would have to be spent out of public tax funds to provide public-school facilities for the children now going to Catholic schools. Added to the \$620,692,000 previously referred to, that makes a total of \$1,120,692,000 in annual Catholic grants, if you will, to the public-school system.

A TOTAL CATHOLIC SUBSIDY TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS EACH YEAR OF \$1,120,692,000

These figures do not, of course, take into consideration the State and local taxes which Catholic citizens pay for the support of the public schools, or the Federal taxes which they pay which help to support any Federal program of aid to education, including the present program for aid to the so-called impacted areas. The total of \$1,120,692,000 refers only to amounts which the public schools would have to spend each year in addition to present expenditures if the Catholic schools did not exist; that is, assum-

ing the States would be making the same effort per pupil as they do now.

In legal terminology, this is a grant-in-aid.

The editorial declares.

Nothing is expected back. There are no bonds, there is no interest to pay. This grant for operating expenses frees other moneys for school construction. The total present grant for the public schools, then, is the annual expenditure of \$500 million for Catholic-school construction, plus the \$620,692,000 for operating expenses, or a grand total of \$1,120,692,000.

The editorial also states this interesting fact:

Turning back to the table which shows the cost per pupil for current operations, we find that the South presents the acute problem. The small Catholic population in that section makes a magnificent gift—\$56,466,000—to the public schools, and this is more than the total expenditure for operating public schools in 19 of the States of the Union. But it spreads thin over the almost 10 million pupils in that section.

If the Catholic-school population of the South were sufficient to provide for that section the bonus the Northeast enjoys (\$52 per pupil) the expenditure in the South, with no additional taxation, could be \$190 per pupil, or only \$5 less than the expenditure in the Northeast and \$4 more than the expenditure in the North Central States.

#### CATHOLIC GIFT TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS EXCEEDS PROPOSED FEDERAL AID

Mr. Speaker, I believe these facts shed needed light on an important problem, helping to bring understanding of the magnificent contribution to American education now being made by Catholics and the Catholic schools.

Since there is to be, this November, a White House Conference on Education for which the Congress has appropriated funds, and since there is pending legislation to adopt a Federal aid program which would include \$400 million a year of direct Federal grants, it is worth noting, as this editorial by Archbishop O'Hara points out, that:

The Catholics of this country, by the construction and operation of their own schools, are doing considerably more for the public schools than the Federal Government proposes to do.

### Reluctance To Employ "Middle-Agers" Is Becoming a National Crisis

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing problems increasingly affecting our American society, from the humane as well as economic standpoint, is that of providing employment opportunities for our older citizens.

Paradoxically and unfortunately, although the blessings of advancing medical research and science serve to bestow longer lives in our times, we nevertheless have fallen into the custom, particularly in industry, of classifying men and women of 40 as "too old." When we

realize that a wartime draft embraces men up to 42 years of age, it would be thought perhaps a little humorous to conceive the maturity of 40 as too old for ordinary employment, if it were not so tragic.

There are, of course, a great number of varied and practical reasons why business, industry and even the Government itself feels that those citizens entering middle age are too old to begin any new employment. Probably first of all, these older people, often with families, cannot support themselves and their families decently at a salary acceptable to a younger beginner; pension systems developed as modern blessings too often prevail upon employers to deny positions to the middle-agers; industrial insurance programs also often serve as a bar, as well as a host of other prejudices.

The closed employment door has developed through no fault of the great legion of mature Americans in the prime of their lives. It is pathetic to think that while the technological advantages of God's providence permitting ever-increasing machine production through replacement of human beings and the developments of modern medicine are adding fruitful years to the average life term, together with the greatest population increase in our history, we are, nevertheless, being unconsciously forced by bewilderment to visit severe and extreme economic hardships upon an age bracket, and their dependents, who could contribute the most to all phases of American development. The seriousness of this situation is further frightening when we reflect that we have not yet really entered into the promising era of peaceful production through the use of atomic science developments.

Mr. Speaker, our learned psychologists and psychiatrists repeatedly testify that experience and statistics clearly demonstrate that the best employee is one of maturity and stability and possessed of a high sense of responsibility. This is a summarized but exact description of the economic value of our middle-aged citizens without reference to their greater values.

This is not, indeed, the time and place to develop an extended discussion of this grave problem. I will not pretend to have any complete solution. There have been many studies made and there are more being made now. The challenge is being increasingly recognized. It is my simple purpose here to emphasize the concern we must all have and the continuing thought we must devote to the solution of the middle-age crisis.

Ways and means to help these mature employable citizens, men and women, to find gainful employment to support themselves and their dependents must be found through encouraging the cooperation of industry, labor, and government units at all levels.

We call ourselves a Christian country. This is primarily a moral obligation upon all of us to insure that no group of citizens in this great country is denied the opportunity to work.

I would like to compliment those conscientious persons in the United States Department of Labor who are giving con-

stant attention to this matter, as well as the great many religious, social, industrial, and labor leaders who are earnestly searching for the corrective answer. As a nation we have met and reasonably resolved many difficulties through our growing generations. We can and will find the right way to utilize the great productive resources residing within our middle-age brackets. We can only do it by persevering study and effort. Under God's guidance and inspiration, let us keep trying.

### Justice and Peace

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Potsdam agreement brings forcibly to mind the principle that there can be no lasting peace without justice.

Americans have always been particularly proud of our love of justice. We have manifested this pride in many ways in the organization and conduct of our Government. The principle of justice is enshrined in the hearts of our people. It is exemplified in our oath of allegiance, "One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Should we wonder, therefore, that hundreds of millions of people throughout the world look hopefully toward us to manifest and implement justice in our international dealings. Should we wonder, in the light of the various conferences during and after the war and some of the unjust agreements arrived at, that many of these people should feel a sense of disillusionment in the sincerity of allied professed ideals.

Many people aspiring to enjoy the fruits and blessings of liberty bitterly protest the Potsdam agreement. Even a brief survey of the consequences of this and other agreements vividly illustrates the opportunism, the compromise, yes, the appeasement of organized world communism that pervaded these conferences and agreements.

In Western Europe and in the Orient, most unwise and unjust concessions resulted in a Marxist Iron Curtain for millions of Germans, Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and oriental peoples, whose zeal for freedom and reliance on the principle of justice deserved a better fate.

Many reasons were advanced for these concessions but none of them exemplify spiritual or democratic ideals. The sad, stark fact is that world communism secured the real substantial advantages that came out of these conferences. In the intervening years we have witnessed, not only the tragic Iron Curtain, but the fall of China to communism and the growth of an international Frankenstein, suppressing human freedom and fostering and spreading Marxism in practically every nation.



I have never felt, and I do not feel now, that the Soviet is the formidable military power many would have us believe. I think that both in military strength and war potential—economic, political, and spiritual—it is not nearly so great and powerful as it has been represented by those who are seeking to intimidate the free nations into further appeasements. Its overall potential does not compare with that of the free nations. We should not, however, underestimate any potential enemy. Neither should we permit ourselves to be terrorized by threats of atomic destruction into further concessions.

We earnestly and prayerfully seek honorable peace and we seek to avoid war by every just and honorable means. Above all, we seek to preserve our freedoms and the freedoms of the free world, our beliefs in the Almighty, our spiritual values, our free enterprise, our way of life and culture, and our profound faith that human existence is inextricably related to the spirit and is something more than the fleshpots and technology of Marxist materialism. Our free society is based on belief in the Divine Master and freedom of the individual. We reject atheism and political tyranny.

The Soviet now has its chance. It can choose peace or it can choose war. If it sincerely wants peace based on justice, it can have it. But if it still seeks by subterfuge and design, trickery, chicanery, and force to carry out further ideological penetration of free nations, incite insurrection and revolution throughout the world, and threaten aggression against free men and women there can be but one result.

Such a result is certainly not sought by any thinking American or indeed by any thinking human. To those who love liberty, death is preferable to slavery. Though atomic war, if it comes, may bring widespread death and devastation, in the end Marxist communism will never triumph over human freedom.

Neither blandishments, nor threats, nor aggressive action will ever deter liberty-loving peoples from successfully defending their precious heritage.

I hope and pray that the Soviet leaders will choose the path of peace rather than the path of war because in the peaceful path lies a better world for all.

### Necessity To Meet the Nation's Health Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent study conducted by the Ford Foundation, based on numerous individual personal interviews, indicates that Americans of all income groups are greatly concerned over health problems and how to meet the cost of illness. This concern also finds expression in the

steadily climbing sales curve for health insurance policies and the increasing number of labor agreements which include health insurance at fringe benefits. Obviously, this great demand on the part of the American people for protection against the cost of illness must be recognized by State legislatures and the Congress.

During the 83d Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under my chairmanship, conducted extensive hearings into health problems and voluntary health insurance. Throughout these hearings emphasis was placed on the present outlook for the treatment and cure of major diseases and how individuals may protect themselves against major medical expenses through voluntary rather than compulsory insurance arrangements. The hearings also highlighted the great need which exists for increased health facilities—including research into and treatment of diseases—and health personnel including physicians, research staffs, and nursing personnel.

There is no simple answer to our health problems. Rather, the answer must be sought in a multitude of measures. Individual health insurance is exceedingly costly and offers comparatively little protection. New ways must, therefore, be found of expanding group coverage. There is some hope that title I of the omnibus health bill now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the reinsurance title—may speed up experimentation with new group coverage in the health-insurance field and particularly with regard to major medical expenses. It is gratifying to learn that the Prudential Insurance Co. of New Jersey has shown commendable interest in this field by recently announcing a plan applicable to those of advanced years. This is a field in which there is great need for a workable plan.

Increasing amounts of private capital must be channeled into the construction of health facilities. I am greatly pleased that the administration has adopted in its proposed omnibus bill the principle of mortgage loan insurance for health facilities which was developed in the course of the hearings during the 83d Congress conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This approach is not dissimilar to the plan that has proved an outstanding success in stimulating residential housing construction. There is every reason to believe that this approach might also be useful in providing additional privately financed health facilities.

In several communities, we have seen competition between health plans sponsored by State or local medical societies on the one hand, and lay-sponsored health plans on the other hand. Competition among these plans has resulted in more extensive coverage, thus greatly benefiting the members of these plans.

Industrial and labor health plans have been inaugurated under numerous collective-bargaining agreements. While many workmen are thus benefited with increased protection against the cost of illness, sight must not be lost of the fact that similar protection must be secured

for individuals not employed in these industries.

Legislation now pending in the Congress would provide some Federal assistance for the construction of medical schools and non-Federal research facilities. Availability of these facilities would make possible the graduating of additional physicians and would provide space for additional research workers.

Finally, Congress has adopted legislation to assist in the financing of a study of present methods of treating mental illnesses. This study amounts to a critical self-examination conducted jointly by those who are primarily concerned with the treatment of mental diseases. The undertaking of this study holds out some hope for the future that we might be able substantially to improve treatment methods now employed. It also may result, I trust, in the improved utilization of available health personnel in the field of mental health.

In conclusion, the health needs of the Nation are so varied and complex with regard to different geographical areas and different diseases that no single answer will be able to meet all legitimate needs. In the case of many diseases, as for example in the case of venereal diseases and tuberculosis, the discovery of new remedies has radically changed our needs with regard to treatment of these diseases. I am hopeful that new discoveries will similarly ease the burden that other diseases have placed on individuals, communities, and governments—local, State, and Federal—but I also hope that the Federal Government will become increasingly active in sponsoring and supporting voluntary methods by which increased protection can be given to individuals against the cost of illness.

### Selective Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. BARRATT O'HARA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of Public Law 118, I have received many letters of inquiry from young men as to how they are affected by this legislation. I presume such has been the case with many of my colleagues.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the analysis of Public Law 118 prepared on my request by the Library of Congress and which I hope will prove as helpful to my colleagues as it has been to me. The analysis follows:

PUBLIC LAW 118, 84TH CONGRESS (AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT)

Section 101:

(a) Exempts from training and service under provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act any person who serves on active duty subsequent to June 24, 1948, for not less than 18 months in the armed forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual defense

activities. Denies this exemption to nationals of country having no such reciprocal provisions for United States citizens. Credits active duty prior to June 24, 1948, in the armed forces of World War II allies with whom the United States is associated in mutual defense activities in the computation of the 18-month service period.

(b) Exempts from training and service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act one who (a) has served honorably in the Armed Forces for a minimum 1-year period on active duty after September 16, 1940, or (b) subsequent to September 16, 1940, was discharged for the convenience of the Government after having served honorably on active duty in the Armed Forces for a 6-month minimum period, or (c) served a minimum 24 months as a commissioned officer in the Public Health Service, or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey except during time of war or national emergency. Subjects this provision to provisions relating to medical, dental, and allied specialist categories (U. S. C. 50 App.: 454 (i)).

(c) Exempts from training and service in the Armed Forces persons who enlist in the State National Guard prior to attaining age 18½ after such persons having reached age 28.

(d) Prohibits consideration of the shortage or surplus of an agricultural commodity in determining where a person should be granted a deferment on the grounds that such person's employment is necessary to the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest.

Section 102: Extends the regular draft for 4 years (until July 1, 1959).

Section 103: Extends the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years (until July 1, 1959).

Section 201: Extends the Doctors Draft Act for 2 years (until July 1, 1957).

Section 202: Exempts from induction under the Doctors Draft Act: (a) medical, dental, and allied specialists over age 35 who have applied for a commission in one of the Armed Forces in any such categories and have been rejected on the sole ground of physical disqualification; or (b) medical, dental, and allied specialists upon reaching age 46.

Section 203: Continues existing law which authorizes additional pay for commissioned officers in medical, dental, and veterinary corps of the Armed Forces serving on active duty.

### The President of the American Bar Association Supports Proposed Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909 by a Bipartisan, High-Level Commission—I

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a bipartisan, high-level commission to study the copyright law and make recommendations for its revision. I am happy to be able to say that my plan has been widely supported. Loyd Wright, president of the American Bar Association, for instance, is "of the opinion that in view of the frustrations that have attended attempted revisions in the past, a thorough study of the copyright laws by an impartial and qualified commission would do much to bring this subject to the attention of Congress for appropri-

ate action." Support was also expressed for the plan I have in mind in a brilliant, hard-hitting speech at the April 1955 convention of the Music Operators of America, held at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago, by Hilmer Stark, general manager of the Billboard magazine's coin-machine division.

On June 7, 1955, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, requested an appropriation sufficient to undertake a 3-year study looking toward revision of the domestic copyright law of 1909 which they described as "archaic." This appropriation was voted by the Congress shortly before adjournment. Although the study has just been authorized, some industry spokesmen are already charging that the study, when completed, will be biased. The Billboard magazine of August 6, 1955, reported that—

Telegrams protesting the (proposed) Copyright Office study as "biased" were sent to chairmen and members of the Appropriations Committee and subcommittee by top officers of Music Operators of America, George Miller and Hirsh De La Viez (Billboard, July 23). Other protests were wired by members of the industry and the Music Guild of America. A committee spokesman acknowledged receipt of the telegrams and said they had been called to the attention of the committee.

That the Music Operators of America, which lodged the protest, is one of the most powerful and representative organizations in the music field is shown by the fact that over 3,000 representatives of the music industry attended the fifth annual convention in April. Over a dozen record companies, 4 jukebox manufacturers, and approximately 80 distributors, leading recording artists in every category from both major and independent labels, song writers, song publishers, and other firms allied with the automatic phonograph industry got together with music operators from every State in the country to iron out common problems and discuss ideas to improve the business on every level. George A. Miller, national president and business manager, advises me that there are some 11,000 music operators in the Nation, plus many thousands of employees. Any charge of bias made by this organization must, therefore, be given considerable weight.

I hope that the Librarian of Congress will take steps to see that the 3-year study is not biased and that the fears expressed by the spokesmen for the music operators are unjustified. I can think of nothing that would be more disastrous both to the Library of Congress and the powerful industries involved than a "biased" study of the very complex subject of copyright law.

I include as part of my remarks two of the many letters I have received, articles from Billboard magazine, and the text of my bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision:

[From the Billboard magazine of July 23, 1955]

**COPYRIGHT OFFICE'S PROPOSED STUDY DRAWS MOA FIRE**

WASHINGTON, July 16.—Strong objection to the Copyright Office's proposed study of the

copyright laws with a view to revision was voiced by the Music Operators of America this week. In telegrams to CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and EARLE C. CLEMENTS, head of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, MOA's vice president, Hirsh De La Viez, characterized both Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyright, as biased. De La Viez added that the study could not be impartial.

In addition to wiring his own protests, the MOA vice president also stated that George Miller, president of MOA, is contacting the Phonograph Manufacturers' Association in Chicago in an effort to enlist further objection against the Copyright Office move.

The Copyright Office plan to conduct its study got quietly underway recently (Billboard, July 7), with a request for an appropriation for additional personnel to help with the proposed 3-year investigation of copyright law. The Fisher request followed on the heels of an exhaustive study of the history of copyright revisions which Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, New Jersey, presented to the House June 23. The Thompson 80-page report is background for his bill of January 20, which would set up an impartial fact-finding commission to investigate the whole Copyright Act and make recommendations for its revision.

Sections of the detailed history made by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, at THOMPSON's request, are being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in installments. The July 12 reading by THOMPSON included mention, without comment, of the Copyright Office request for funds, and added that the House had voted \$20,000 for this study.

Fisher's original request for \$40,000 was cut to half by a House subcommittee, and has already been considered by a Senate Appropriations Committee. The appropriation request is not expected to meet opposition when it reaches the Senate floor.

De La Viez's telegram to the Senators on the Copyright Office study read: "I would like to voice my objection to the section of the appropriations bill (H. R. 7117) for the Library of Congress regarding increased appropriation for a study of the copyright law, as I feel that both Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyright, are biased. It could never be an impartial study of the copyright law."

LAW OFFICES OF WRIGHT,  
WRIGHT, GREEN & WRIGHT,  
Los Angeles, July 19, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,  
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is in response to your note to Loyd Wright asking whether he cared to comment on your three statements published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of your bill to create a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision.

Mr. Wright and I discussed your statements just before he left town last night. We are both of the opinion that in view of the frustrations that have attended attempted revisions in the past, a thorough study of the copyright laws by an impartial and qualified commission would do much to bring this subject to the attention of Congress for appropriate action.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD M. GOLDWATER.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., August 2, 1955.  
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR THOMPSON: With a great deal of interest, I have learned of your extension



of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1955, pages 9142-9146; June 28, 1955, pages 9424-9427; and July 12, 1955, pages 10364-10369. All of this material relating to copyrights is interesting, especially the text of the study of techniques employed in efforts at major copyright law revision since 1909, which was prepared for you by the Library of Congress. All of us who are interested in copyright legislation are certainly indebted to you for making this text available to the public through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder whether you have an extra copy of the pages containing your remarks. If so, I would be very happy to receive them, as I would like to preserve this material in my files for future reference.

Also, if you have any mailing list of lawyers interested in copyright matters, to whom you send material of this kind from time to time, I would be grateful if you would add my name to such list. Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

CHARLES SHEPARD,  
Chairman, Committee on Copyrights,  
American Patent Law Association.

#### H. R. 2677

A bill creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Copyright Laws (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

Sec. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 13 members appointed as follows:

(1) Seven persons appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Three appointed from the Senate by the Vice President of the United States; and

(3) Three appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Of the first class of members specified in subsection (a), no more than four members shall be from the same political party. Of the second and third classes of members specified in subsection (a), no more than two members from each class shall be from the same political party.

Sec. 3. The President shall designate the member of the Commission who shall be the chairman, and the member who shall be the vice chairman.

Sec. 4. Seven members of the Commission (including at least three who are Members of Congress) shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 5. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members of the Commission from private life shall receive not to exceed \$25 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

Sec. 6. The Commission is directed to examine, study, and make recommendations for the revision of all laws pertaining to both domestic and foreign copyright.

Sec. 7. (a) The Commission, in carrying out its functions under this act, may appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, with-

out regard to the civil-service laws, and shall fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 55a), but at rates not to exceed \$25 per diem for individuals. The Commission may reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

(b) Service as a member of the Commission (except service of a member appointed by the Vice President or the Speaker of the House or appointed by the President from the executive branch of the Government), employment of an individual pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (a), and service by a person pursuant to the second sentence of subsection (a), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 512 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99).

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 9. (a) Within 30 days after the commencement of the first regular session of Congress convened more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

(b) Sixty days after submission to the Congress of the report provided for in subsection (a) of this section, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Sec. 10. The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such times and places, within the United States or elsewhere, to take such testimony, and to make such lawful expenditures, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

[From the Billboard magazine of April 9, 1955]

#### WHY FACTFINDING: STARK MOA SPEECH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of the unusual interest in the address made at the convention of Music Operators of America by Hillmer Stark, general manager of the Billboard's coin machine division, the complete text of his speech follows.)

Copyright legislation is one of the uppermost thoughts in your mind. Since I represent the Billboard, you will want to know why the Billboard has proposed factfinding.

Let me preface my remarks by stating that we on the Billboard cannot disagree with the stand taken by your MOA officers and by the phonograph manufacturers since obviously the current exemption, in effect since 1909, is a law which is on your side. And, equally obviously, to endorse factfinding or to take any other stand would be an admission that the law should be changed.

Why, then, does the Billboard propose factfinding? One good reason is that we believe it's time to settle this problem. We can and have placed ourselves in a position where a sincere and honest conviction may lead to a solution of this controversy.

It is interesting to note that the stand we have adopted has had two results:

1. We are charged by those who seek to obtain a performance right from the jukebox industry that we have instituted a delaying action—that a Presidential Fact-finding Commission could take 2 or 3 years

to study copyrights and reach some conclusions.

2. On the other hand, there have been charges that we seek to lead the jukebox industry down the primrose path to excessive performance royalty payments to ASCAP and BMI.

#### UNPOPULAR STAND

In other words, the stand we have taken is not popular with the leaders in either camp. By setting aside any commercial impulses to sell advertising, we prove we are sincere in the concept of solving this problem that I will unfold to you today.

Just why did the Billboard propose fact-finding. Development of this policy came after years of study and deliberation. A policy for the good of our readers, not only jukebox operators, but every segment of the music industry—authors, composers, publishers, record companies, and others.

The Billboard believes that the 1909 exemption is wrong.

But two wrongs do not make a right. The Billboard recognizes that it would be an even greater wrong if the exemption were removed, exposing jukebox operators to the mercies of a virtual monopoly.

#### NO CHANGE

We do not believe that any change should be made in the existing law until such time as guaranteed safeguards have been erected so that you as users of music can deal as equals, individually or collectively, with the immensely powerful licensing organizations, and that these safeguards must protect you from indefinite and unreasonable fees, present and future.

That is an oversimplification of the thinking and the answering of a myriad of questions which led to our conclusion for fact-finding.

Here's why, in capsule form:

1. While recognizing performance rights and, too, the unfairness of exposing jukebox operators to a monopoly, we also could not see how any conceivable solution could be reached by congressional committees who for many years have not been able to reach a solution.

2. We believe that the yearly battle is taking thousands of dollars which might more properly be devoted to building the jukebox business, and it certainly hampers your development into background music—music service without coin-operated mechanisms—which is subject right now to payment to the licensing organizations.

#### BITTERNESS OF FEUD

3. The bitterness of the yearly feud has made it impossible for either side to even recognize a valid offer by either side. The battle is waged along strict lines of either being pro- or anti-exemption.

4. We feel that while a copyright is a thing of value, it is equally valid to say that no jukebox operator should pay more for that music than it is worth to him.

If you're thinking this was a pretty big chaw, you're so right. In seeking the answers, we found that despite our years of contact with you and every other segment of the music business, we didn't know the answers. But we did have one opinion on how the answers might be found.

We don't believe that congressional committees can arrive at a conclusion that would satisfy all segments of the music industry—primarily the jukebox operators—because they are the smaller group, composed of individuals, who might well be subjected to attack as individuals by a powerful licensing organization.

#### OTHER SIMILAR BODIES

We believe that one form of investigation—that of presidential fact-finding committees—is probably the most free and unbiased way of seeking answers to problems of this kind. It has been done on tariffs, on juvenile delinquency, and on many other lively ques-

tions which faced even larger groups of contestants.

It is our sincere belief that such a group, composed of Congressmen, lay neutral persons, and economic experts might arrive at some way of settling this dispute, which, if allowed to continue, might damage irreparably the music industry, and I speak not only of jukebox operators and authors, but also of record manufacturers, music publishers and others in the music industry.

We hesitate to recommend anything beyond this one point to a fact-finding commission.

Find a way in which to solve this dispute; recognize not only the right vested in a copyright, but also the right of the purchaser to pay only in relationship of value. But, above all, find some way in which the user of music can deal on an equal basis with a virtual monopoly.

#### EQUAL BASIS

The last point is terribly important. If you and I were dealing in a tangible product which was made by 5 or 6 other producers, we would be free to tell 1 seller to go to blazes and buy from the other seller. But the product which you as jukebox operators use is pre-eminently currently popular music of which better than 90 percent is controlled by the licensing organizations, and you can't make money with Jeanie With the Light Brown Hair.

Yes; you could argue that you've fought it out for years and that there has been no change in the law. Here we enter into an area of opinion on whether this was the year in which the bill—this year called the Kilgore bill—might have passed—and still might pass.

Knowing you—and many of those authors who furnish today's popular music—we don't believe you are very far apart. Perhaps we have partially alienated both groups, but the role of peacemaker invariably finds that person in the way of the barrage. If we can in some small way help to end the copyright difficulty, we will be content. But, mind you, never until it is an equitable settlement that is mutually satisfactory.

#### PAY OR NOT PAY

Factfinding committee action could well find that you cannot pay additional fees, or that you can. It might find some way of coupling the mechanical royalty to a performance royalty, basing it on the number of records purchased, but it could be decided fairly. It is our contention that the jukebox operator has nothing to fear from such an appraisal of the situation.

I can promise you this: That just as we have called for stopping action on all proposals that seek to end the exemption—we're outspokenly and categorically against them—so will we maintain a vigilant watch over any straying from the path on the rights of the jukebox operator.

And if you should be thinking that the Billboard is risking your future, just hold these points in mind:

We were convinced all along that another attempt would be made by ASCAP to remove the exemption in this session of Congress. In this respect we were right.

We were mighty sure your leaders would fight this bill as openly and effectively as they have in the past. In this respect we were right.

#### ASCAP OFFENSIVE

But we have also been sure the offensive by ASCAP would be better organized than ever before, and thus the chances of passage were better in this session. Here again you can say we were right in view of the number of Senators sponsoring the bill.

Our proposal for factfinding does not in any way hinder your leaders in their defense. The Billboard is opposed to the Kilgore bill as strongly as they are.

And we sincerely feel factfinding may wind up your substitute safeguard if the

Senate passes the Kilgore bill. It has already virtually assured your industry of fair hearings in the House, if not the Senate, whereas there was a danger that the Kilgore bill would be passed without a hearing.

The Billboard's proposal for factfinding is being heard in Washington. It may never seriously be considered, but it has already been effective in warning Congressmen and Senators alike that there is more to this problem than simple removal of the exemption.

We don't expect you to support factfinding as long as the law is on your side. Neither do we expect ASCAP nor BMI to support it. But factfinding pushed by the Billboard may very well be your refuge in case the Senate passes the Kilgore bill.

And we feel certain that you prefer factfinding to the Kilgore bill.

### The President of the American Bar Association Supports Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909 by a Bipartisan, High-Level Commission—II

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks excerpts from a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909:

#### VIII. THE DUFFY BILL, 1936

Preliminary to considering the Duffy bill, S. 3047, 74th Congress, certain events which had occurred in the preceding Congress should be mentioned:

1. June 10, 1933, Senator Cutting introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 1928) entitled "To enable the United States to enter the International Copyright Union."

2. May 31, 1933. Mr. Luce introduced the same bill (H. R. 5853) in the House.

3. February 19, 1934. The President sent the Bern Convention as revised at Rome in 1928 to the Senate for ratification of United States adherence.

4. March 28, May 28-29, 1934. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Cutting bill and the convention.

5. Opposition to adherence to the convention developed at the hearing and some witnesses even urged that efforts to revise the law completely be renewed. It was suggested that the Secretary of State confer with the various conflicting interests, obtain their viewpoints and report to Senate committee.

6. Accordingly an interdepartmental committee was created composed of Dr. Wallace McClure and Mr. Joseph T. Keating, of the State Department, Mr. William L. Brown, Register of Copyrights, and his Assistant Register, Mr. Richard C. De Wolf, and Mr. James L. Brown, of the Department of Commerce, who was later replaced by Mr. L. G. Koebfle, of that Department. This committee drafted a bill which became known as the first Duffy bill.<sup>1</sup>

On April 1, 1935, in the 74th Congress Senator Duffy introduced the first Duffy bill as S. 2465. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Patents which appears to have

held hearings on it which do not seem to have been printed. No further action was taken on S. 2465. On June 17, 1935, Senator Duffy introduced a revised bill as S. 3047. Senator Duffy described the background of the bill starting with the hearings on the Cutting bill and the convention in the 73d Congress:

"It soon became evident from the testimony before our subcommittee that there was a very decided difference of opinion prevailing among those who might be affected by such action. There was a very marked conflict of interest as it appears here today from the discussion so far had. If this committee were to join with almost 50 other countries and become a party to the International Convention of the Copyright Union it was generally agreed that some enabling legislation would be necessary in order to adjust the provisions of our law to the provisions of the treaty.

"It was generally recognized that for a quarter of a century there had been no comprehensive revision of the copyright law and that greatly changed conditions had occurred in the means whereby artistic works are communicated to the public. Almost everyone who has given study to the question agrees that many changes in our copyright law are highly desirable by reason of these changed conditions.

"Our subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee reported to the full committee. We reported that there was this wide difference of opinion. The entire committee then decided to request the State Department to organize an informal interdepartmental committee to confer with the various conflicting interests in an endeavor to reconcile as far as possible such divergent viewpoints. Such a committee was formed. I desire the Senate to know the membership of this committee because it is very important in the discussion of this question.

"Two of the members of the committee were from the Department of State. Two of the members of the committee represented the copyright office itself. They would be certainly as well acquainted with this subject as any man who could be chosen. The fifth member of the committee represented the Department of Commerce.

"When the bill finally took shape as a result of these hearings I introduced it in the Senate and it was referred to the Committee on Patents. The Committee on Patents then held hearings and had conferences on it [committee hearings referred to are not available in the Library of Congress and it would seem that they were not printed]. The bill was cut up to a considerable degree and revised and I then, at the request of several members of the Committee on Patents, introduced into the Senate the revised bill which is now before the Senate for consideration."<sup>2</sup>

Senator Duffy also indicated that the treaty had been favorably reported to the Senate on April 18, 1935.<sup>3</sup> It was unanimously ratified by the Senate on April 19, but on his request and by unanimous consent such action was reconsidered and the treaty was placed back on the Executive Calendar to await action on the revised Duffy bill.

The Senate Committee on Patents then considered Senate 3047 and reported the same favorably to the Senate (S. Rept. 896, 74th Cong.). After considerable debate on the Senate floor the bill was passed in the closing days of the session with an amendment, known as the Vandenberg amendment, providing for design copyrights, and another restoring the manufacturing clause.

In the House the Committee on Patents held hearings during the second session on the Duffy, S. 3047; Daly, H. R. 10632; and

<sup>1</sup> Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Ex. Rept. E. 73d Cong., and Ex. Rept. No. 4, 74th Cong.

<sup>2</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, p. 12188.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings on revision of copyright laws, 74th Cong., pp. 1175-1176.



Sirovich bills, H. R. 11420. These hearings were held on February 25, 26, 27; March 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31; and April 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, all in 1936. Some of the difficulties with which the House committee was beset are indicated by an interchange between the chairman and other members of the committee occurring during the first day of the hearings as follows:

"The CHAIRMAN. I have consulted with both the people who are in favor of copyright legislation, in favor of the Duffy bill, and other legislation, and those opposed to it, and we are giving every side an opportunity to present their side, either for or against. Every individual who is interested in copyright legislation will have his opportunity to present his side. Four or five years ago we gave every side a fair and square deal, and the opportunity to present their matter. In fact, the bill was reported out by the committee and brought on the floor. A few Members of the House objected that we had not given all the time necessary to people who wanted to be heard, and the bill was recommitted to the committee just for that purpose. We do not want to conduct the hearings in the way that the committee did 5 years ago, so we are going to give everyone an opportunity to present any views that they have for or against on the subject so that they can have a fair and square deal on both sides.

"Mr. LANHAM. May I say just a word there in explanation?

"Of course, my colleague, Mr. Church, is relatively a new member of the committee, as are most of the members. Many years ago we started in on this matter of copyright. We had 8 years of hearings, and after years of reconciliations that were effected among the divergent interests during that time, this committee was able to report a bill to the House.

"Mr. PERKINS. You refer to the Vestal bill?

"Mr. LANHAM. I refer to the Vestal bill, which passed the House with one very slight amendment.

"That bill went to the Senate. At that time the session of Congress adjourned on the 4th of March. The bill was under consideration at the time of adjournment and the filibuster with reference to another measure prevented the conclusion of the consideration of the copyright bill. The hearings during those 8 years were quite voluminous, and covered every aspect of this important subject of copyright. Those hearings are available.

"I understand that it is the desire of those who are sponsoring this legislation, the various bills, to try to get legislation at this session of Congress, if possible. From the experience we have had in this committee heretofore, knowing what a complex subject this is, if we should hear the proponents of this measure and then hear the opponents of the measure the bill would be dragged along indefinitely, because I know the ramifications of such a discussion by experience.

"My thought is, though I have nothing to do with the control of the procedure, that perhaps a more expeditious way of considering this is to hear those who object to this bill, assuming that the proponents of the bill are for it, and direct our attention to those features which are in conflict, giving the proponents the opportunity for rebuttal. It seems to me if we do not adopt some such policy as that, the hearings will just drag on and on indefinitely.

"Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that the public who have come from so many miles to be heard ought to know generally from the chairman your plan of dates for their hearings.

"The CHAIRMAN. We have done that already.

"Mr. CHURCH. I certainly as one member would insist that persons introducing a bill be first heard, because you have the whole

world to resist and oppose until you hear the promoter of a bill.

"Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see that it makes any great difference whether we start in the middle of the hearing or not.

"Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has intimated that I am not familiar with this procedure. I am familiar with the past hearings. I am familiar with the 16 years of legislative experience. I have never sat in a committee before where you hear the opponents first. I appreciate the statement in every way here today. There is no reflection against Mr. Buck for that information. But I do think that this committee should hear the people interested in the passage of this bill first.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mr. Perkins.

"Mr. LANHAM. May I say that I have interrupted to add that my suggestion was made merely in the interest of conserving time, because the reference in this bill is not objectionable to anyone. I think it is unnecessary to have long and tedious explanations of those passages.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mr. Perkins.

"Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, several of the members of this committee, particularly Mr. LANHAM and myself, have been sitting on these hearings for the past 16 years. The matter of copyright legislation is now on the books. The bills before us propose changes in that legislation. I am inclined to agree with Mr. LANHAM that the more practical way is first to hear the objections to the changes and give the benefit of reply to those who suggest the changes.

"This is not exactly as if it were entirely new legislation where proponents would come in and make suggestions or would come in with a new bill. The bills before us are merely changes in the copyright law, and for the sake of conserving time and narrowing the issues and giving those who propose the changes the opportunity of hearing the objections, I think the method the committee is proceeding with is much better than to hear the proponents first.

"Mr. CHURCH. Let us hear the program of dates of hearings, then, at this first meeting before we go into the House.

"Mr. PERKINS. Of course, for the benefit of those who are here to testify before the committee and to save their time, it would be well if the committee could outline the days and the hours when the various witnesses could be heard.

"Mr. DALY. May I be heard on that, Mr. Chairman?

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Daly.

"Mr. DALY. I want to say in reply to Mr. Church particularly that as I understand the situation here, the copyright law of 1909 is not satisfactory to anybody. With the many inventions and various changes since 1909, I think everybody agrees there should be new copyright legislation. That assumed tangible form in the Duffy bill and was introduced and passed. There were a number of protests, particularly from the society represented by Mr. Buck, who are vitally interested in it. They have serious objections to the Duffy bill, they being of the opinion that it did not give the protection that should be given to various artists of various kinds.

"To endeavor to get really at the matter, two other bills were introduced in the House. Dr. Sirovich introduced one and I introduced the other. So we practically have before us first the copyright bill of 1909, second, the Duffy bill, and third, these two bills.

"In order that everybody might get a hearing and the committee might be enlightened on all the aspects of this case, Dr. Sirovich outlined a program covering 4 weeks, 3 days a week for 4 weeks. All those who opposed the Duffy bill were asked to come here. All those who favored the Duffy bill were asked to come here. There may be

serious objections to either the bill Dr. Sirovich introduced or the bill I introduced, before we get through. But he has, Mr. Church, outlined a program outlining the 4 weeks.

"Mr. CHURCH. I am familiar with that, as to the dates.

"The CHAIRMAN. You have been given the dates.

"Mr. CHURCH. You refer to the fact that we have hearings scheduled for 3 days a week for the next 4 weeks. Put my people from Illinois cannot come down and spend their time here 3 days a week for 4 weeks, in addition to their mileage. I have asked the chairman to outline a plan whereby these people may get together today or tomorrow and determine the dates when they may want to be here.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me explain that, if you will permit me to explain it:

"The program that we have outlined is to have the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, the Authors' League, and the Dramatists' League present their side. After they have finished, which will be within the next week or the following week, we are going to have the hotel owners, the department stores, the radio people, the motion-picture exhibitors and distributors, and the various other organizations who have come to our committee and who have received their turn. We wrote a letter to about 200 individuals and organizations, asking what time would be convenient for them, and we have had to establish the time that would be convenient for all.

"Mr. McLEON. Right there, all of these hearings and all of these dates are not centered on any one bill but on the question of copyrights."

It would be too confusing to attempt to show the proponents and opponents of these three bills. Needless to say, the witnesses were not in agreement on any one bill. The following is therefore based upon whether the witness was in favor of or opposed to the Duffy bill.

Those in favor of the Duffy bill were:

F. Ryan Duffy, United States Senator from Wisconsin.

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, Department of State.

James W. Baldwin, managing director, National Association of Broadcasters.

Sydney M. Kaye, attorney, National Association of Broadcasters.

Louis G. Caldwell, attorney, National Association of Broadcasters.

H. B. Somerville, chairman, national legislative committee, American Hotel Association.

Carl L. Cannon, Yale University Library.

Henry Jaffe, of the firm of Whitman, Ransom, Coulson, & Goetz, New York.

Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights.

Homer E. Capehart, the Automatic Musical Instrument Association.

John E. Dowling, tariff council, United States Potters Association.

A. D. Haake, the National Association of Furniture Manufacturers.

Harvey Willson, general manager, National Upholstery and Drapery Textile Association.

Miss Mary Vendelari.

E. L. Kuykendall, president, Motion Picture Theater Owners of America.

William G. Vliederman, the Christian Science publishing interest.

Those opposed to the Duffy bill or certain features of it were:

Gene Buck, president, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Deems Taylor, director, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

William Joseph Hill, composer.

Rudy Vallee, orchestra leader.

E. C. Mills, general manager, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

<sup>4</sup>Hearings, revision of copyright laws, op. cit., pp. 23-25.

George M. Cohan, playwright, actor, and songwriter.

Elmer Davis, vice president, Authors' League of America.

George Creel, manager, Authors' League.

Thyra Sampter Winslow, authoress.

Ben Lucien Berman, author.

Mary Heaton Vorse, authoress.

Manteel Howe Farnham, authoress.

Chester Crowell, author.

William Hamilton Osborne, the Authors' League.

Louise Sillico, secretary, Authors' League.

George Middleton, playwright.

John Howard Lawson, playwright.

John G. Falne, Music Publishers Protective Association.

William Arms Fisher, Boston Music Publishers Association.

James Francis Cook, president, Theodore Presser Co., and editor of Etude.

Francis Gilbert, attorney, the Music Publishers Protective Association.

The Honorable Karl Stefan, Representative in Congress from Nebraska.

H. A. Huebner, the Brunswick Record Corp. and Columbia Phonograph Co.

R. W. Uitschuler, president, American Record Corp.

Isabell Marks, Decca Records, Inc.

Fulton Brylawski, Motion Picture Producers.

Fred Waring, president, National Association of Performing Artists.

John O'Connor, National Association of Performing Artists.

Samuel Tabak, Local No. 802, New York City, American Federation of Musicians.

Frank Crumit, singer.

Louis James, member of the Revellers Quartet.

Arthur Bryant, composer.

Gen. Samuel T. Ansell, general counsel, American Federation of Musicians.

Guy Lombardo, conductor.

Maurice J. Speiser, general counsel, National Association of Performing Artists.

Miss Mary Bendelari, National Council on Design.

Marvin Pierce, the National Publishers Association.

Melvin H. Coulston, Eastern Railroad Association.

Edward A. Brand, attorney, Tanners' Council of America.

Harry Leeward Katz, general counsel, Music Users Protective Association.

R. B. Fletcher, counsel, the Association of American Railroads.

Karl Fenning, patent attorney.

S. G. Nottingham, patent attorney.

Sylvan Gotshall, attorney.

Weil Gotshal and Manges, attorneys.

Miss Irene L. Blunt, secretary, the Industrial Design Registration Bureau.

Irwin C. Fox, National Dry Goods Association.

U. Forest Walker, R. H. Macy & Co., New York.

Henry W. Carter, the Glass Container Association of America.

Charles Ballon, the Popular-Price Dress Manufacturers' Group Inc.

Mr. Golby, executive secretary, Fashion Originators Guild.

William Cheney, eastern managing director, National Retail Furniture Association.

Hugh F. Hall, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Charles E. Boyd, the Retail Merchants Association.

Milton Tibbetts, vice president, Packard Motor Car Co.

Louis Rothschild, the Retailers National Council.

Henry D. Williams, attorney, the firm of Williams, Rich & Morse.

Thomas E. Robertson, formerly Commissioner of Patents.

Frederick G. Melcher, National Association of Book Publishers.

William O. Tufts, Rand-McNally Co. and National Association of Book Publishers.

Hon. Conway P. Coe, Commissioner of Patents.

Edwin P. Kilroe, attorney, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation and Movietone News, Inc.

Fulton Brylawski, counsel, Copyright Committee of the Hays Organization.

Gabriel L. Hell, general counsel, attorney for Hays Organization.

Henry C. Harding, the Independent Songwriters of America.

Nathan Burkan.

R. S. Ould, patent attorney.

The fact that the hearings ran to some 1,560 pages and that the Vandenberg amendment for design copyright had brought in many commercial firms as witnesses made the picture even more confusing than usual. In fact, the situation generally would appear to have been summed up at the beginning of the testimony of Frederick G. Melcher, the National Association of Book Publishers:

"We are appearing in this hearing to comment on the Duffy and other bills, and in doing so I am aware of the long years of discussion in which many of the opinions we might express are already recorded and have been studied by ourselves and other members of the committee, and we do not want to take your time to repeat on things which do not need new emphasis. We are aware, also, that as the years go by it does show, shall I say, our national incapacity to legislate on a very important fundamental issue. This incapacity to legislate, which is clear in my mind, having represented this industry for a dozen years and because my partner was active in the hope of our making such progress for many years before—Mr. Bowker—is not due to the partisan character of the legislation, which I think we all appreciate, as we have had equal consideration under the different administrations; and it has not been due to any lack of application on the part of the legislators, but has been due to our inability to compose urgently expressed points of view, particularly from the point of view of our new entrants into the field of copyright, and not so much on the part of book publishers, who even precede, I think, the authors in point of protection."

The inability to compose urgently expressed conflicting views as indicated by Melcher seems to have been the stumbling block in each of the several attempts by legislative committees to achieve a major copyright revision. The committee did not report any of the bills to the House and they died with the close of the 74th Congress.

### The President of the American Bar Association Supports Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909 by a Bipartisan, High-Level Commission—III

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the concluding portion of a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the Copy-

<sup>5</sup> Hearings, revision of the copyright laws, op. cit., p. 966.

right Law of 1909. Charles Shepard, chairman of the Committee on Copyrights, American Patent Law Association, has written to me in support of this brilliant study, saying:

With a great deal of interest, I have learned of your extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1955, pages 9142-9146; June 28, 1955, pages 9425-9427; and July 12, 1955, pages 10364-10369. All of this material relating to copyrights is interesting, especially the text of the study of techniques employed in efforts at major copyright law revision since 1909, which was prepared for you by the Library of Congress. All of us who are interested in copyright legislation are certainly indebted to you for making this text available to the public through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I include here, also, a letter I have received from Charlotte E. Gauer, executive secretary, American Patent Law Association, expressing the gratification of the members of that organization for the information made available in the able study made by Freeman W. Sharp, American Law Division, Library of Congress:

AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C., August 2, 1955.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Your comments which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to the creation of a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for the revision thereof were referred to our committee on copyrights, of which Mr. Charles Shepard, of Rochester, N. Y., is the chairman. As a result, I am pleased to advise you that the members of this association who practice in the copyright field show great interest in this study and wish to commend you for making the results of this study available to the people through its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is the sort of information that is not generally available in one package and it is very gratifying to have it in this form.

We will, of course, follow these matters with interest.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLOTTE E. GAUER,

Executive Secretary.

#### IX. THE SHOTWELL COMMITTEE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, 1937-40

One final attempt at copyright revision was made during the period under discussion, this time by a private organization, the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation. This committee was formed by the League of Nations in the early twenties. Since the United States failed to join the League at the conclusion of World War I, the committee was an unofficial body with respect to the Government of the United States. The League established an International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation under which a number of regional committees functioned. The national committee was one of the regional committees.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> League of Nations, Secretariat, Information Section. Essential Facts About the League of Nations, 10th edition, revised, Geneva 1939, p. 265, etc. "As soon as the League was founded efforts were begun for improving the International Organization of Intellectual Workers. On December 18, 1920, the first assembly requested the council to associate itself as closely as possible with all such efforts. The assembly had in view the



A subcommittee entitled "Committee for the Study of Copyrights" was established by the national committee for the purpose of solving the various existing problems in achieving international copyright protection. The subcommittee also attempted to solve the United States domestic legislative problems respecting copyright protection in order to facilitate its entrance into the Bern Convention or a modified form thereof. Prof. James T. Shotwell, of Columbia University, then chairman of the national committee, also became chairman of the Committee for the Study of Copyright.<sup>2</sup> Professor Shotwell was succeeded by Dr. Waldo G. Leland,<sup>3</sup> director emeritus of the American Council of Learned Societies. Through the courtesy of Dr. Leland, permission has been granted to quote from a manuscript history of the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, written by Edith E. Ware, who was executive secretary of both the national committee and the Committee for the Study of Copyright.<sup>4</sup> Miss Ware describes the copyright revision effort:

"Until 1938, the national committee had never made any attempt to understand the copyright situation. It had accepted the opinion of Herbert Putnam in 1926, and in 1933 had received a memorandum from Llewellyn Raney, director of the University of Chicago libraries, protesting the manufacturing clause of the United States copyright law and urging adherence to the International [Bern] Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. In 1935, after asking for a specific provision in the Duffy bill designed to facilitate the use of microcopy for purposes of research, the national committee, without specific knowledge of all the issues involved, went on record as prepared to testify in support of the Duffy bill and the Bern Convention. But in December 1938, the national committee had another story to tell. Its committee for the study of copyright, which had been in existence for a little less than a year, had formulated a program whose influence persisted for over a decade.

possible setting up for this purpose of a technical organization attached to the League."

This organization now exists in the Intellectual Cooperation Organization of the League of Nations, which forms one of the League's four technical organizations side by side with the Health, Communications and Transit, and Economic and Financial Organizations. Its constitutions received the formal approval of the assembly on two occasions, in 1926 and in 1931. It is composed as follows:

1. International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. An advisory organ of the council and the assembly. It consists of 19 members appointed by the council. It directs the work of intellectual cooperation.

2. Committees of experts to answer special questions. Some of these are permanent while others exist only for a limited period. This organization has three working bodies (a) the Intellectual Cooperation Section which is its administrative secretariat and the (b) International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (Paris) which is its executive organ. The institute prepares for meetings of expert committees, it arranges for inquiries that have been ordered and publishes the results. There are 44 national committees established in various countries including the United States where the committee is known as the National Committee of the United States of America for International Intellectual Cooperation.

<sup>2</sup> See Who's Who in America, vol. 28, 1954 through 1955, p. 2438.

<sup>3</sup> See Who's Who in America, vol. 28, 1954 through 1955, p. 1580.

<sup>4</sup> Ware, the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, 1926-48.

"On January 1, 1938, when the Committee for the Study of Copyright began its investigations, the International Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works was on the Senate Calendar, and several bills to amend and consolidate the copyright law, including the Duffy bill, reintroduced as S. 7, were before the Patents Committees of both Houses of Congress. But there appeared to be little likelihood of any action being taken on the subject of copyright protection, national or international. Two interesting facts appeared to be responsible for this stalemate. First, on account of an inherent opposition to legislation by treaty or to the obligation to legislate according to terms of a treaty, there was universal demand that revision of copyright legislation must precede any affirmative action in relation to international copyright protection as embodied in the Bern Convention. Second, there was quite general and determined opposition to a number of important provisions in the bills then before Congress, which were designed to amend the existing copyright legislation of the United States with a view to entrance into the Bern Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. In addition, there was divergent opinion as to the merits of the Bern Convention itself, and a shocking absence of information and interest in inter-American copyright relations.

"In view of this situation, the Committee for the Study of Copyright, at its meeting with experts and consultants on February 22, 1938, committed itself to the principle of universal protection of literary and artistic works. It did not, however, define its position in relation to proposed conventions designed for international copyright protection. Instead, it proposed to study existing laws and treaties.

"This was imperative in the face of the domestic situation, the forthcoming conference at Brussels for the revision of the Bern Convention, and the draft conventions which were being circulated to American States preparatory to their discussion at the inter-American Conference at Lima in December 1938."

"However, in view of the forthcoming Brussels Conference which hoped not only to revise the Bern Convention but to draft a universal convention, the Committee for the Study of Copyright, as a subcommittee of the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation and therefore within the International Cooperation Organization, sent a representative to the meeting of the committee of experts that was to confer at Paris and Brussels, October 19 to 21, 1938, on the agenda for the Conference for the Provision of the Bern Convention. Francis Deak, because well informed through the good offices of the Committee for the Study of Copyright concerning opinion in the United States with respect to the Bern Convention, and because of previous association with the institutions sponsoring the meeting and with its individual members, was able to clarify reasons for the nonaffirmative action on the part of the United States with respect to the Bern Convention and to win restatement of certain important proposals. His Report on the Status of International Copyright Protection and on the Brussels Meeting of the Committee of Experts, published by Columbia University Press in 1938, was an important contribution to the understanding of the work of the committee of experts.

"The chairman of the national committee, at its meeting on December 10, 1938, informed the members present that Edith E. Ware, the executive secretary of the Committee for the Study of Copyright, and the com-

mittee's consultant on Latin American Copyright Relations, William Sanders, chief of the Juridical Division of the Pan American Union, were at the Eighth International Conference of American States at Lima, Peru (December 9-27, 1938), on behalf of the recommendations of the Committee for the Study of Copyright with respect to inter-American copyright relations."

"The Committee for the Study of Copyright also attempted, in 1938, to resolve the domestic legislative problems of international copyright protection. Representatives of authors, publishers, labor, motion-picture producers, broadcasters, mechanical recorders, libraries, and scholars were invited to roundtable consultations, where in daily meetings of small committees and later of the committee of the whole that continued through 1939, a new copyright bill was drafted. It was introduced into the Senate, as S. 3042, on January 8, 1940. France fell in May.

"The Brussels Conference for the Revision of the International Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works was postponed because of the war. When it did meet in July 1948, it did not attempt to draft a universal convention, for in 1947 UNESCO had begun a study of international copyright laws and relations with a view to improving international copyright relations on a basis more inclusive than that of the Bern Convention."

During the course of 1938 and 1939, many studies were made by the Committee for the Study of Copyright, and a considerable number of meetings and conferences were held with the various interests concerned in the problem of domestic copyright revision. At these meetings the following were represented:

Authors' League of America: Mrs. Louise Silcox, Mr. John Elliott.

Labor: Mr. Michael J. Flynn, Wage Earners Protective Association; Mr. Clyde Mills, Typographical Union; Judge J. Raymond Tiffany, general counsel, Book Manufacturers Institute.

The American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers: Mr. John G. Paine, general manager; Mr. Gene Buck, president; Mr. C. E. Mills, chairman, board of directors; Mr. Schwartz, general counsel.

Book Publishers Bureau: Mr. Frederick G. Melcher, chairman of the Copyright Committee, Book Publishers Association (magazines); Mr. Marvin Pierce, chairman of the copyright committee; Mr. George Lucas, radio (National Association of Broadcasters); Mr. Sydney M. Kaye, motion picture producers and distributors; Mr. Edwin P. Kilroe, chairman of the copyright committee; Mr. Gabriel Hess, general counsel; Mr. Robert W. Perkins, general counsel for Warner Bros.

Scholarship: Mr. Robert C. Binkley; Mr. Richard Manning, small committee (originally invited), chairman of the copyright committee which already existed; Mr. Melcher, book publishers; Mr. Kilroe, motion pictures; Mr. Pierce, magazine publishers.

Radio: Mr. Sydney M. Kaye.

ASCAP: Mr. John Payne.

Labor: Mr. Michael J. Flynn.

Authors: Mrs. Louise Silcox.

The Committee for the Study of Copyright worked very hard to achieve a general revision. Its papers, now in the possession of the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, occupy some seven file drawers. It should be noted that the Register of Copyrights did not participate in the work of the Shotwell committee. In fact, he later expressed his opposition to many features of the bill drafted by that committee. The committee completed its final draft of a proposed bill on

<sup>5</sup> Ware, op. cit., p. 81.

<sup>6</sup> Ware, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

<sup>7</sup> Ware, op. cit., pp. 79-80.

December 18, 1939. This bill, known as the Shotwell bill, was introduced in the Senate on January 8, 1940, by Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, as Senate 3043.<sup>8</sup>

The text of the bill together with an explanatory statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. No action was taken on the bill during the year 1940. The outbreak of World War II in Europe during 1939 had focused attention on other and more pressing problems. At the conclusion of World War II the League of Nations expired and the United Nations was established. Dr. Leland liquidated the remnants of the national committee and the Committee for the Study of Copyright. Thereafter efforts to secure universal cooperation in copyright were continued under the UNESCO organization of the United Nations.

Since World War II the effort to secure a new international copyright convention has been successful. No general revision of the United States copyright law has been undertaken, and efforts to have the United States adhere to the Bern Convention were abandoned. Instead, the United States participated in preparing the Universal Copyright Convention which was completed in 1952 and signed by the United States and 39 other countries, including both members and non-members of the Bern Union. In 1954 the United States ratified the convention and implementing changes in the copyright law were enacted by Congress in Public Law 743, 83d Congress.

In reporting the bill, H. R. 6616, 83d Congress, for compliance with the Universal Copyright Convention the House Committee on the Judiciary explained its effect on the present copyright law:

"The principal amendments to the United States copyright law which are necessary are the relaxation, as to foreign works, of the requirement of United States manufacture, a slight modification of the form of copyright notice, and the elimination of the requirement of deposit of two copies of foreign works in the United States Copyright Office.

"The Universal Copyright Convention, in order to overcome the objections of the United States and other nonsignatory nations to the features of the Bern Convention, is based on the concept of national treatment. In other words, instead of seeking to establish uniform international standards of copyright, or, in effect, establish an international copyright law, this convention merely seeks to guarantee to works first published in any signatory nation the same copyright protection in other signatory nations as is given to works first published in such other nations or of nationals of other signatory nations. It does not seek to eliminate differences in copyright theory which exist throughout the world or to harmonize national laws, but instead recognizes existing differences. Also, it has no retroactive effect on works already in the public domain in any contracting states and does not provide for automatic copyright without formalities which rendered the Bern Convention incompatible with American copyright law."<sup>9</sup>

In order for the Universal Convention to become effective 12 countries must deposit their ratifications. Ten have done so to date, including the United States. The necessary additional deposits of ratifications are expected to be received soon.

Since the statement, supra, concerning the ratification of Universal Convention was written the following information has been received:

#### "UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION RATIFIED

"Word has been received from the Director General of UNESCO that the Universal Copy-

right Convention will come into force on September 16, 1955, by virtue of the deposit of the ratification of the required 12 countries. The principality of Monaco deposited the 12th ratification on June 16, and the convention comes into force, according to its terms, 3 months thereafter.

"Public Law 743 (approved August 31, 1954), the recent amendment to the copyright law that implemented the United States ratification of the treaty, also becomes effective on September 16, 1955. Accordingly, on and after that date, works first published in the following countries or works by nationals of these countries will receive the benefit of the new law: Andorra, Cambodia, Chile, Costa Rica, German Federal Republic, Haiti, Israel, Laos, Monaco, Pakistan, and Spain. In essence, such works will receive automatic copyright protection in this country without the necessity of complying with the formalities of the United States law. Likewise, works by United States authors, or those first published in the United States, will receive protection in these 11 countries merely by the fact that they were published in the United States."<sup>10</sup>

#### X. CONCLUSION

The foregoing résumé discloses a variety of methods employed in the attempt at copyright revision. Briefly, they may be characterized as follows:

1. The first attempt, that of the Dallinger bill, might roughly be termed the "employment of counsel method" in that after many conferences by an industry group, one of the interested parties retained counsel to draft a bill which was then introduced by a sponsor, Representative Dallinger.

2. The second method might be termed the "expert method" in that the Register of Copyrights, Mr. Salberg, as a one-man expert, drafted a bill, then introduced by Representative Perkins.

3. The next effort might be termed the "agreement within industry method" in that one of the groups within the industry attempted by conferences with interested parties to draft an acceptable bill (the Vestal bill).

4. This was succeeded by what might be termed the "legislative investigation method" in that the congressional committee, without considering a specific bill, held hearings to determine for itself the views of all the interested parties, and on the basis of these hearings drafted a bill (the Sirovich bill).

5. The next effort might be termed the "interdepartmental committee method" in that an interdepartmental committee attempted to draft a bill (the first Duffy bill) with limited objectives. Opposition, however, forced an extension of the objectives to greater areas of revision resulting in the second Duffy bill.

6. The final effort might be termed the "private party method" in that the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation through its subcommittee, the Shotwell committee, drafted a bill (the Thomas bill) which attempted to reconcile the various conflicting interests.

It should be borne in mind that while our entry into the Universal Copyright Convention did not involve a comprehensive or even a major revision of the American copyright laws it did constitute an important achievement in copyright procedure. This was done by treaty and implementing legislation. The details for the United States were worked out by the Librarian of Congress, the Register of Copyrights, and the State Department in a series of conferences involving all major interests.

Instead of utilizing any of the techniques or methods utilized the Thompson bill (H. R.

2677) proposes a Federal Commission—comprising, as already indicated, both Presidential and congressional appointees—to "examine, study, and make recommendations for the revision of all laws pertaining to both domestic and foreign copyright."

## Politics Hurt Duck Shooting

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the fine production of ducks in the Canadian prairie provinces permitted the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow Montana duck hunters an additional 15 shooting days this season.

With the increase, Montana will have a 75-day season on ducks, with bag and possession limits of 5 and 10, the same as last year.

Early this year, the duck hunters of western Montana asked for a migratory waterfowl season that would give them some shooting and, at the same time, be fair to eastern Montana hunters.

More than 4,000 signed petitions asking that that part of Montana west of the Continental Divide be taken from the central flyway and placed in the Pacific flyway. The request was based on the fact that mountainous wooded western Montana is much more like the area in the Pacific flyway than it resembles the plains of the central flyway and that the 80-day season of the Pacific flyway should apply to western Montana instead of the 60-day season of the central flyway.

These sportsmen of Montana are dedicated to the sound principles of conserving our waterfowl resource. They felt that a change would give hunters a reasonable opportunity to harvest this resource.

The senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, and I worked closely with the Montana Fish and Game Department and the Fish and Wildlife Service on this problem.

We met with Mr. John L. Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Out of these meetings came a recommendation for an 89-day season for Montana, depending of course on the production of ducks, with a decrease in bag and possession limits if necessary. With the help of the ducks, we got a 75-day season, an increase of 15 days, with no decrease in bag and possession limits.

The June issue of Sports Afield magazine carried a discussion of proposals to liberalize waterfowl regulations. Michael Hudoba, the magazine's Washington editor, said that if there is to be liberalization of waterfowl rules, it should be in longer seasons—because that is where the average hunter gets a better break.

Since Mr. Hudoba wrote his article, the information has come in on this year's waterfowl population. And it is good. The breeding grounds of the

<sup>8</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, pp. 68-78.

<sup>9</sup> H. Rept. 2608, 83d Cong., pp. 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> Library of Congress, Information Bulletin, vol. 14, No. 25, June 20, 1955, p. 7.



prairie Provinces—Alberta, Saskatchewan, and northern Manitoba—produced a crop of ducks large enough so that the seasons could be lengthened. The article follows:

#### POLITICS HURTS DUCK SHOOTING

Will waterfowl regulations this fall be set to the whim of political expediency?

This is a question that your reporter can treat only from straws in the wind, with the hope that—for the sake of waterfowling's future—later developments may prove him wrong.

This issue was thrown wide open back when the Eisenhower administration lifted the directorship of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service out of career civil service status and made it a political appointment. As this report predicted, that move made the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department vulnerable to political pressures and recriminations, which always had been present, but not have substance of political meaning.

As a result, most potent pressures about waterfowl regulations are piling up on the higher echelon of the politically conscious Interior Department. Even though no information is yet practical on the status of this year's waterfowl populations or breeding-ground results, there are demands for baiting of waterfowl and for relaxation and zoning—types of measures that would add to expanded waterfowl kill.

Also facing a crisis is the enforcement of waterfowl regulations. The outcome will determine the future effectiveness of waterfowl rules. This is another political issue.

Senator JOHN BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, had John Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in his office to discuss the waterfowl program. While no details of the talks are available, the effective activities of a Federal game agent in enforcing waterfowl regulations in northern Ohio, as reported in the Toledo Blade, did come under heavy fire.

Director Farley finds himself on the spot by the potency of a Senator and Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis, the top-level Interior Department Administrator of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Lewis, as well as Mr. Farley, has to answer to politics. If the enforcement activities of Federal game agent Fred L. Jacobson are affected, the resulting blow to the morale of the Fish and Wildlife Service enforcement staff would be disastrous.

And what of ducks, geese, doves, and migratory birds in such a mire of political currents? That's up to the sportsmen of our country. Either we can let the matter drift to an inevitable debacle, or we can demand that the best interests of a continuing migratory-bird population be served first.

It had been a long-standing policy of the Fish and Wildlife Service to resist zoning of a State for waterfowl shooting. Yet, the concern of early and late season waterfowlers is a pressing issue, accentuated by short-season seasons because of waterfowl declines.

The frustrations of the annual weather guessing game to get a good season for both early and late waterfowlers has developed a climate of impatience to zone. Until waterfowl populations are up enough to warrant extending the season to its previous long terms, the tug of war and weather guessing will continue.

But the Department of the Interior and its Fish and Wildlife Service have given in to zoning in one State (Long Island, N. Y.). As a result, at least eight States are strongly demanding a zoned waterfowl season.

The toughest issue, as far as political pressure is concerned, is baiting. While most of the States indicated they did not want waterfowl baiting, there are powerful demands piling in from at least three States

for legalized baiting. This is the kind of pressure that politically vulnerable agencies find hard to resist.

Both zoning and baiting raise the basic question of what about waterfowl populations since these birds haven't shown any marked improvement. Yet both demands can only lead to increased kills of ducks and geese. And once zoning and baiting were set up as policies, they would be hard to get off the books in case of a sharp decline in migratory bird numbers. If that should happen, the average waterfowler, without club facilities, is certain to be squeezed out of his traditional sport.

If there's to be a liberalization of waterfowling rules, let it be in longer seasons. There is where the average waterfowler can expect his better break. But the average waterfowler is faced with the need to speak up strongly now, or subtle currents are likely to take his sport out of range.

### Appraisal of the 1st Session of the 84th Congress

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, and the time has come for an appraisal of the work done. There was much conjecture at the beginning of the session as to just how President Eisenhower and our Republican administration would fare with a Democrat-controlled Congress.

I suspect that when every Member has had his say there will be just about as many varied opinions registered as there are Members of this distinguished body, all colored by individual tastes, political affiliation, and peculiar interests.

As I see it, this 1st session of the 84th Democrat-controlled Congress left more undone than it accomplished except in the field of foreign affairs and national defense.

The following major legislative proposals of President Eisenhower were not enacted by the Democrat Congress:

- First. Expanded highway program.
- Second. Federal aid to school construction.
- Third. Federal grants to needy school districts.
- Fourth. Atomic peace ship. Authorized but not enacted.
- Fifth. Customs simplification bill. Passed House, pending in Senate.
- Sixth. Hawaiian statehood.
- Seventh. Legislation strengthening internal security of United States.
- Eighth. Amendments to Taft-Hartley law.
- Ninth. Work-hours legislation.
- Tenth. Aid to low-income farmers.
- Eleventh. Strengthened Federal program of drought aid.
- Twelfth. Constitutional amendment lowering voting age from 21 to 18.
- Thirteenth. Comprehensive program of water resources.

Fourteenth. Immigration and refugee law amendments.

Fifteenth. Federal health reinsurance program.

The record of actual accomplishment except in the field of foreign affairs and national defense is disappointing particularly in domestic affairs. The box score of major legislation enacted is as follows:

First. Authorized President Eisenhower to use the Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Second. Extended to July 1, 1959, authority to draft men 18½ to 26.

Third. Extended to July 1, 1957 authority to draft doctors, dentists, and allied specialists.

Fourth. Extended provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act.

Fifth. Established a national program for Military Reserves.

Sixth. Provided rewards for information on illegal importation, manufacture or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons.

Seventh. Extended to June 30, 1958, President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements, reduce tariffs 5 percent a year for 3 years.

Eighth. Authorized and appropriated \$2.7 billion for program of economic and military aid to foreign countries under the Mutual Security Act.

Ninth. Increased pay for Federal classified workers, postal employees, Federal judges, district attorneys, and Members of Congress.

Tenth. Extended to April 1, 1956, existing excise tax schedule, and the 52 percent corporate income tax.

Eleventh. Increased minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1 an hour effective March 1, 1956.

Twelfth. Authorized 3-year program to complete the Inter-American Highway.

Thirteenth. Approved sale of 25 synthetic rubber plants owned by the Government.

Fourteenth. Extended Reorganization Act of 1949 to June 1, 1957.

Fifteenth. Extended for 2 years the period for making emergency loans to farmers and stockmen.

Sixteenth. Repealed the penalty that withholds soil conservation payments from farmers who exceed planting allotments.

Seventeenth. Granted \$63 million in Federal aid to airports.

Eighteenth. Authorized free polio shots for 33⅓ percent of unvaccinated children between the ages of 1 and 19, and for expectant mothers, the program to end February 15, 1956.

I realize that it is not fair to compare the record of a single session with that of an entire Congress but on the basis of what little was done during this 1st session of the 84th Congress all the stops will have to be pulled out during the next session if the 84th Congress is to come anywhere near matching the enviable record of the Republican controlled 83d Congress.

As a parting word I would just like to say that I am sure many of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will find while home in their constituencies

that the President's program is favored by the majority of the people the country over, and they ought to firmly resolve to join with our side in getting the entire program enacted into law next session.

### Legislative Powers of Congress Usurped by United States Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. CECIL R. KING**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," is an age-old maxim being proven again and again in our expanding national economy.

The inquiries made by investigating committees of Congress have uncovered rank abuse and misapplication of well-meaning laws. Laws enacted by Congress to enhance the general welfare and promote the national economy.

Usually these abuses arise by a creeping expansion of Government agencies' power, and are often not immediately apparent.

Such has been the case of the Home Loan Bank Administration. Commencing in 1937, rules and regulations were changed slightly here and there, which eventually provided a means of confiscating the peoples' savings. A plan of confiscation which has prohibited the aggrieved citizens—the savings depositors—from having prior notice, or court trial, for the seizure and confiscation of their property.

By the creeping agency changes in regulations, expanding its own power, the agency assumed a purpose foreign to, and destructive of, the congressional intent. Congress, in its enactments of 1932-34, specifically stated the primary purpose of such laws were to promote the general welfare and provide a safe place for the citizens to place their savings.

It is obvious from the language and legislative history, Congress never intended to provide an entity, through which the citizens' savings could be seized and confiscated. There is nothing in the act that indicates the citizen's right to redress to the United States courts, should ever be cut off. Nevertheless, the agency expanded its power by its self-made regulations, and by such self-enacted regulations, cut off court redress.

Such agency managed to concentrate the whole diabolical scheme into one man's hands. When the 5-man bipartisan Board, created by Congress, was abolished, the resulting 1-man Commissioner, claimed he was responsible to no one.

Armed with their own self-expanded regulations, the agency, in 1946, seized a solvent and prosperous \$26 million savings association. Congress, through its special committee, headed by the Honorable HOWARD SMITH, unanimously

condemned such action. The congressionally created agency blatantly defied Congress and claimed the United States courts were without power or authority to intervene.

To this day the seized \$26 million of cash, United States Government bearer bonds, and other negotiable assets, have not been fully accounted for.

Every citizen may justly ask, How can such infringement of human rights happen here? The answer is simple. The United States appellate court—circuit court—has failed, on numerous occasions to perform their functions. Such failure has perpetuated the agency frauds.

Specifically, in 1952, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, upheld the self-enacted agency regulations, which denied the jurisdiction of the United States courts to intervene or grant relief to the thousands of stricken homeowners, and the multi-thousands of savings investors, who were victims of the agency confiscation.

Congress, when it became fully convinced the courts had, in their ruling, disregarded the purpose and intent of the congressional enactment, attempted to correct the evil by adopting the Housing Act of 1954. Such act granted remedial and procedural rights to all aggrieved citizens. Such new enactment specifically granted jurisdiction to the United States district courts throughout the United States, to hear the claims of aggrieved citizens, and to enforce the laws of the United States.

The Government agency asked, but Congress refused, to limit this sweeping grant of remedial and procedural rights to new causes of action, and struck from the proposed bills all restrictive language. Thus, under the new law, old depositors as well as new, are given like protection under the law.

Congress, in its endeavor to protect its citizens against the misapplication of agency power, subordinated all conflicting laws in clear and specific language, as follows:

Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

This 1954 congressional enactment clearly subordinated prior United States circuit court rulings inconsistent therewith, and specifically granted to the aggrieved savings depositors and homeowners a right to a trial on the merits in the United States district courts, on their claims of fraud and confiscation against these Government agencies.

Nevertheless, the United States circuit appellate court, in defiance of the clear language of the congressional enactment and its legislative history, held, in July 1955, that such congressional enactment was inapplicable to the defrauded Long Beach citizens, and purely prospective. Thus, the circuit court denied our aggrieved citizens the protection of the laws enacted by Congress, and made applicable the language rejected by Congress. Thereby the circuit court has perpetuated the frauds and injustices perpetrated upon our citizens by a Government agency. The injustices and frauds of these Government

agencies in the Long Beach seizure precipitated the remedial and procedural enactments by Congress in specifically granting jurisdiction to the United States district courts.

Congress did not create such appellate courts to supplant the wisdom of Congress in the enactment of laws. Congress, in creating the United States circuit appellate courts, did so with the intention, among other things, of upholding the constitutional guaranties to our citizens against fraudulent and capricious actions of agencies and bureaus.

Such courts, however, have not always proven capable. Congress recognized the fallibility of these appellate courts when it restricted such courts' power to hold unconstitutional congressional enactments by injunction.

Here, the United States circuit appellate court specifically denied our citizens the procedural and remedial benefits of laws enacted by Congress, and by injunction cut off the citizen's right to court protection and trial under the law. The citizen's constitutional guaranties against confiscation and seizure of their savings and property, are nullified. Self-expanded and self-created agency regulations are substituted for right and justice, and are sustained by the United States appellate court injunction.

The failure of the United States circuit appellate court to uphold the citizen's constitutional guaranty is plain. A full investigation of the congressionally created United States appellate courts is here indicated as a necessity. Perhaps a reorganization of such appellate judicial system may be a necessity in the light of its defiance of acts of Congress.

The example here emphasized is only one instance of the ever-mounting disregard of justice and equity by such courts.

### Major Actions of 1st Session of 84th Congress in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. BARRATT O'HARA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on the actions of the 1st session of the 84th Congress in the field of our relations with other nations.

The report follows:

BARRATT O'HARA'S REPORT FROM CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: As a world power, our relation with other nations is of importance. I will try to give you the complete picture of what the Congress did in this field in the year 1955.

Major legislative actions of the 84th Congress in the field of international affairs were eight public laws (66, 86, 91, 129, 138, 196, 285, and 350), 2 House concurrent resolutions, 2 Senate resolutions, and 7 treaties ratified by the Senate.



Public Law 66, continued to July 1, 1956, suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. The others I will cover in order.

#### PUBLIC LAW 86

##### H. R. 1, reciprocal trade agreements

Public Law 86 extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act from June 12, 1955, the date of its expiration, to June 30, 1958. It probably is the most important enactment of the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Failure to extend the trade agreements would have been a serious blow to our economy and, I am afraid, to our national security. Chicago, in the center of a large industry area, would have felt the full force of the blow.

Nevertheless, Public Law 86 was enacted only after the bitterest of fights. The debate in the House was colorful and dramatic. Members sat motionless in their seats in rapt attention. On an early vote on a parliamentary move we actually were defeated by 29 votes, 178 to 207.

The reversal came only after Speaker RAYBURN had taken the well (where Members stand when addressing the House) on one of the few such occasions and threw everything that he had in eloquence and prestige into the scales. The result was we won the next rollcall by 2 votes, 193 to 191. At another critical stage, when defeat seemed imminent, former Speaker MARTIN took over for the minority leadership. This time we squeezed through by 1 vote, 193 to 192. There were 49 absentees—illustrating the importance of attendance. So with the full force of (1) the administration, (2) the majority leadership, and (3) the minority leadership, the victory was won only by an eyelash.

On the motion to recommit, the vote was 199 yea, 206 nay, and on the final passage 295 to 110.

Reason for strength of opposition was that old-school protectionists had teamed up with Members from the coal and other areas where unemployment was attributed to the importation of fusel oil, glassware, and some other articles.

The intensity of the Members from hard-hit West Virginia and the mining districts of Pennsylvania heightened the emotional atmosphere in which the battle was waged. They felt that they were fighting for home and fireside. (Major cause for decline in use of coal actually was dieselization of railroads. Another: We cut our importation of blue cheese from Denmark, and Denmark canceled her orders for United States coal and transferred them to Poland. World trade is not a one-way street.)

The bill passed by the House was the bill recommended by President Eisenhower on the Cordell Hull pattern. Senate amendments watered it down. This watering down was made primarily by changes in the "escape clause," the "peril point," and "national security" provisions. The escape clause previously applied to an industry adversely affected by foreign imports. It now applies to specific commodities produced within the industry.

Reciprocal trade agreements were inaugurated in 1934. The United States now has agreements with 42 nations carrying on 80 percent of world trade, totaling over \$40 billion a year. The United States exports 20 percent of the goods in world trade, imports 15 percent. That means that while we furnish a rich and necessary market for friendly foreign countries, they actually buy 5 percent more from us than we sell to them. Furthermore, but for the reciprocal agreements these foreign nations would not have the dollar buying power to do business with us.

It is estimated by the Department of Labor that 4½ million jobs in the United States are dependent on the foreign market, both export and import. In 1951 agricultural exports reached \$4 billion, representing the

production of from 50 to 60 million acres of cultivated American farms. Since then the falling off of farm exports has resulted in lower farm prices, increased surpluses, acreage restrictions. Similar repercussions would attend the decline of our industrial exports.

But even more important: the surest path to security and peace is trade on a fair and equitable basis. During the past year Russia has negotiated many new reciprocal trade agreements with her satellites, some with neighboring European countries. We have entered into no new agreements. Meanwhile Red China flirts with Japan, knowing that Japan to eat must have imports and to exist industrially must have a market for her manufactured wares. I think you will approve my casting of your vote for Public Law 86.

#### PUBLIC LAW 91

##### H. R. 5695, import tax on copper

This continues to June 30, 1958, the suspension of the copper import tax. While the United States is the world's largest copper producer, it consumes (thanks in part to the auto industry) more than it produces. Countries that benefit from a duty-free market for their copper are Chile, Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Africa.

#### PUBLIC LAW 129

##### H. R. 5923, Inter-American Highway

This I rate among the constructive accomplishments of the first session of the 84th Congress. It authorizes the immediate appropriation of money sufficient to complete the construction of the Inter-American Highway (from the Mexican border clear through to the Panama Canal) within 3 years.

Total cost will be \$112,470,000. The United States assumes \$74,980,000 as its share. Combined share of cooperating countries is \$37,490,000 on a 2-to-1 matching basis. A wise investment, I think, having in mind (1) hemispheric security and solidarity, (2) development of neglected and heretofore isolated areas, and (3) the closer knitting together of the peoples of Pan America in understanding neighborliness. It is to our own mutual interest that we should live with our neighbors south to the canal on the basis of real personal friendship.

Hence I regard the decision to hurry the Inter-American Highway to completion as a heartening advance in good international relationships. Moreover, to complete the project in 3 years will require an enlarged fleet of road building equipment with skilled operators and personnel from the United States, meaning jobs for workers here in our factories and on the site of the project.

I was interested in learning from the debate of the progress already made. In answer to a question Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN was assured that today he could drive from his district in Michigan to the northern part of Guatemala without leaving a good hard road. (Later I heard that the road approaching Guatemala is not too good, almost impassable during the rainy season from May through October.) It seems that Mexico completed her own road to the Guatemalan border entirely at her own expense, and that Guatemala extended a portion of the highway from her border at her own expense.

In all, Mexico has built 1,600 miles of highway. That left 1,590 miles to complete the highway to the Panama Canal. On this the United States has been working in co-operation with Central American republics since 1934, has spent \$57.7 million to date. There remains to be completed 25 miles in Guatemala, 134 miles in Costa Rica, and 14 miles in Panama, which are now impassable.

Three years more and you can pack the family in your automobile and go sightseeing all the way to the Canal. Look for mobile home settlements multiplying in tropical scenic locations in Central America. With

the present blockstops removed, the highway will open up a new era for the Central Americans and our relations with them. It will stimulate development of new agricultural areas and of natural resources. New possibilities will be opened to United States capital and the promotion of trade.

Here are some interesting figures cited in the debate: In the year we started on the highway program our exports to Central America totaled \$116 million. In 1954 our exports to those countries totaled \$950 million. Imports grew in value from \$78 million to \$560 million. In 1954 American tourists in the Caribbean area spent over \$1 billion.

Public Law 129 passed the House by a vote of 353 to 13. I think I used your vote wisely and as you would have approved in supporting the measure and opposing all delaying and weakening amendments.

#### PUBLIC LAW 138

##### S. 2090, Mutual Security Act

Public Law 138 is the basic legislation (the authorization, not the actual appropriation) for (1) military assistance and (2) technical aid to other countries in the fiscal year 1956. It also authorizes contributions (among others) to United Nations Technical Assistance Program (\$24 million), Organization of American States (\$1.5 million), United Nations Refugee Fund (\$1.4 million), for CARE and surplus foods transportation (\$15 million), for resettlement of refugees (\$6 million), to U. N. Agency for Palestine Refugees (\$65 million), to U. N. Children's Fund (\$14.5 million).

Authorizations total \$3,252,868,000. This is \$486,993,000 more than similar authorizations for the fiscal year 1955, an increase of about \$0.5 billion.

Briefly, this is the world picture as reflected in Public Law 138 and as presented in the debate:

#### Europe

Grants and technical assistance practically at an end. Present drive is to make friendly nations militarily strong. Please note this language: "The Congress believes it essential that this act should be administered . . . to promote greater political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe." Something in the nature of a United States of Europe would seem to be the indicated objective.

Further reason for military assistance to friendly nations is given in the statement of congressional policy (sec. 549): "To defend themselves against aggression and contribute to the security of the free world" and "to assume an equal station among the free nations . . . and to fulfill their responsibilities for self-government."

Under Marshall plan, inaugurated in 1948 exclusively as economic-aid program, \$17 billion was distributed in 4 years, the peak being reached in 1950. This put our European allies on their feet economically. The 1956 authorizations for defense and military assistance exceed \$1 billion, only \$98 million for grants and direct technical assistance.

Spain, Yugoslavia, and the city of Berlin are the beneficiaries of the latter. Spain, now furnishing large military bases to the United States, needs improvement of railroad lines and powerplants, also irrigation and reclamation to bolster her agricultural economy. Yugoslavia, flirting but in her way holding the line in Eastern Europe in alliance with Greece and Turkey, will get some \$46 million for technical assistance and machinery imports. A gesture with a calculated risk—keeping Tito independent of Moscow by giving him some United States help.

#### Asia

Aim is to help in development of resources and raising of living standards, to offset Soviet technique of conquest by infiltration and subversion. In this area (771 million people, third of world population) money so ear-

marked, no military assistance except for Korea and Formosa.

Illustration of tentative projects: development of Mekong River (of potential value to Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand), fisheries, minerals, transportation.

Providing for nonmilitary assistance to Asia is \$1.4 billion. Loans rather than grants, wherever possible, is emphasized. Chairman Richards pinpointed the reasoning: "The people of India have blamed their lot on the British. Now the British are gone they are finding the problem of raising their standard of living both difficult and complex. If they cannot show results their ears will be turned to Moscow."

#### Near East, Africa, Latin America

Drive in these areas is on the development front. For assistance in building dams, powerplants, and other works to accelerate the fight on poverty and meager living conditions \$73 million is earmarked for the Near East and Africa, \$38 million for Latin America. In addition they will share in the technical cooperation and crop improvement program, \$127.5 million direct United States aid, \$153 million through U. N. This I think is a sound program. A world without poverty is a world without the tensions that breed wars, also a world of buying markets for our wares.

#### Red China

Section 12 of Public Law 138 declares it the continuing sense of Congress that Red China should not be admitted to the United Nations.

#### PUBLIC LAW 196

##### H. R. 6059, Philippine trade agreement

Until 1946 the United States had no experience in granting independence to a part of its territory. Trade with the Philippines had been on an inter-American basis. When we granted independence trade had to be transferred to the basis of one sovereign nation dealing with another sovereign nation. But economic relationships do not change spontaneously with those of a political nature. There must be a period for readjustments. So in 1946 we entered into a reciprocal free-trade agreement with the Philippine Republic. It provided (among other items) for gradual imposition of customs duties, beginning with 5 percent a year and reaching 100 percent by 1974.

In 1953 the new Republic, making real progress but having its own problems in rebuilding from the war, requested a revision of this agreement. Representatives of both countries met in Washington in the fall of 1954 and worked out the revisions covered in Public Law 196.

What Public Law 196 does is to give the Philippines a needed assist in building up her economy.

Importance of this legislation is, it (1) strengthens our friendship with the Philippines; (2) buttresses a cathedral of democracy in the Far East; and (3) highlights the policy of our Government to help other peoples attain political independence and economic stability. The story of our treatment of the Philippines and our continuing friendship is the best answer to evil propaganda.

#### PUBLIC LAW 285

##### H. R. 6382, international claims settlement

American citizens have claims against Russia (dating back to the czars), Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Italy that total possibly more than \$1 billion. They are based upon war damage, nationalizations, and pre-war governmental debt (bonds). On hand to pay these off is \$41 million; \$9 million received from Russia in 1933; \$5 million from Italy in 1947; and \$27 million realized from the blocked assets of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

Public Law 285 authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to proceed with the distribution. Purpose of the legis-

lation, recommended by the President, is to get the money (little in proportion as it is) to the claimants without further delay. There is only a slim chance, if any, of anything further being realized. A matter of clearing up the bankrupt estate of war and fallen dynasties.

#### PUBLIC LAW 350

##### S. 1894, International Finance Corporation

Presently there are two banks supplying capital for the development of backward areas under the point 4 programs: (1) The International Bank, to which the United States makes the largest contribution of any of the participating nations, and (2) our own Export-Import Bank. The latter has made an enviable record, with tremendous results achieved and at a substantial profit to the Federal Government.

Public Law 350 authorizes United States participation (with 42 other nations) in a third bank, the International Finance Corporation, to make risk loans not acceptable to the existing 2 banks. Capital of IFC, \$100 million; our contribution, \$35.1 million.

IFC concept was endorsed in 1954 by U. N. by a 50 to 0 vote, met with favor at recent Pan-American Conference in Brazil. Venture (risk) capital badly needed in countries south of us. Possible forerunner of consumer credit in Latin America, now under serious consideration to bolster buying power of those countries.

This measure was cleared through the Banking and Currency Committee, of which your representative is a member. In committee and on the floor of the House I gave it my full support, but only with the assurance that IFC would not compete (and ultimately undermine) the Export-Import Bank.

In committee I asked Secretary of Treasury Humphrey if it was the intention of IFC to raise additional capital by the marketing of its debentures. He replied he hoped IFC could be as successful in that regard as the International Bank.

In my remarks on the floor of the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 1, 1955, p. 12661) I stressed the advisability of caution against excessive offerings of bond issues since, in the case of the International Bank, about 85 percent of its debentures had been marketed in the United States. IFC is to make risk loans. Until we see how it works out, with the contribution our Government is making, I hope the risk will not be passed on to individual American investors. It is so easy for persons with modest savings and no financial advisers to get hurt.

#### RESOLUTIONS

##### Senate Resolution 93, disarmament

Creates a bipartisan committee of 10 Senators to make study of proposals for disarmament and control of weapons of mass destruction.

##### Senate Resolution 127, captive nations

Proclaims the hope of the Senate that peoples in "captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination \* \* \* and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter."

##### House Concurrent Resolution 149, communism and colonialism

Declares that "Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man." Expresses the sense of Congress that foreign policy and influence of United States "support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world."

##### House Concurrent Resolution 157, reaffirms hope for peace

This is the resolution adopted unanimously by House and Senate on the occasion of

the meeting at San Francisco commemorating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. It "reaffirms the deep desire of the people of the United States for an honorable and lasting peace, and expresses the hope that the people of all the nations of the world join with the people of the United States in a renewed effort for peace." The President is requested by the Congress to convey an expression of such reaffirmation and such hope to the assembled nations.

#### TREATIES

Article II, section 2, paragraph 2 of the Constitution states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

During the first session of the 84th Congress by the required two-third votes the Senate ratified the following treaties:

1. Treaty for collective mutual defense of southeast Asia signed by United States, Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Great Britain, and France. Ratified February 1, 1955, by vote of 82 to 1.

2. Treaty for mutual defense signed by United States and Republic of China. Ratified February 9, 1955, by vote of 64 to 6.

3. Treaty signed by United States, England, France, and West Germany terminating occupation of West Germany and recognizing sovereignty of Federal Republic. Ratified April 1, 1955, by vote of 76 to 2.

4. Protocol to North Atlantic Treaty signed by 14 nation members of NATO admitting West Germany. Ratified April 1, 1955, by vote of 76 to 2.

5. Protocol of International Telecommunication Convention at Buenos Aires signed by United States and 82 other countries cooperating in regulation of radio frequencies. Ratified April 1, 1955, by vote of 63 to 3.

6. Treaty for the reestablishment of an independent and democratic Austria signed by the United States, Great Britain, France, U. S. S. R., and Austria. Ratified June 17, 1955, by a vote of 63 to 3.

7. Conventions governing treatment of prisoners of war and protection of civilians in time of war, signed at Geneva, August 12, 1949. Ratified July 6, 1955, by vote of 77 to 0.

As your representative, I have had no part in treaty-making. I have added them merely to complete the picture of international affairs.

NOTE.—There is much talk in Washington of the growing national stature of Senator WALTER F. GEORGE and Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairmen, respectively, of the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Affairs. RICHARDS' handling of bills on the floor of the House was masterful, attracted favorable comment of Members and observers. Congressman THOMAS GORDON, Chicago, is No. 2 man on the committee, next to RICHARDS. He is quiet, effective, a very valuable aid to the chairman.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,  
Member of Congress.

## Report to the Constituents of the 12th Congressional District of New York

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to remain in close contact with the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I



have the honor to serve. I have attempted to let all of its residents know that the office here in Washington and the Brooklyn office in the Federal Building have been open to them at all times. It has been my aim to assist them in their problems with the Federal Government. At the same time I have attended, congressional duties permitting, meetings, functions and gatherings in order that I may know more intimately the people I represent in Washington. My aim is to cement a close relationship between the Congressman and his constituents.

On Saturdays I have been in my Brooklyn office to receive all who wished to discuss their problems with me personally. During the week, it was my pleasure to receive in Washington, the Brooklyn visitors who called on me.

I have made every effort to have some contact with as many of my constituents as possible. To this end, and shortly after President Eisenhower delivered his state of the Union message, I mailed a questionnaire to the voters of the district requesting that they express their opinions concerning the legislative program outlined by the President.

I deeply appreciate the assistance I received from the thousands of voters who replied. And in that connection, I should like to call attention to the wisdom of the great Irish statesman, Edmund Burke, who in stating what a Representative should be and what a constituent should expect of his Representative, once wrote:

A Representative should live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitting attention \* \* \* but a Representative's unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to any man, or to any men living. \* \* \* Your Representative owes you not his industry only, but also his judgment.

Now that the first session of the 84th Congress has wound up its work, I consider it both fitting and proper that the people of my district should know how I have served them. I have therefore drawn up this report which I now submit to the House. It is my intention to have it circulated as widely as possible throughout the 12th Congressional District of New York so that the people may know of the activities of their Representative.

In the short span of 7 months, the length of the congressional session this year, my office has sent out a total of 163,000 pieces of mail. Of this, 150,000 were the questionnaire. The remaining 13,000 letters were in direct reply to mail received from the district, and my communications with the executive agencies. This total, when broken down further shows that an average of 86 letters per workday go out to and in behalf of the people I am privileged to serve.

During this session I have personally introduced numerous pieces of legislation. A vital measure which I am firmly convinced should be enacted is one to revise the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, so that foreign governments

will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

Another very important piece of legislation which I have sponsored is an amendment to the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which wives and widows may qualify for benefits under the law.

Still another important bill I have introduced is an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, to increase the annuities of retired Federal employees. This did pass the Congress and was signed by the President. The House bill did not carry my name, but rather a committee bill was acted upon; however, the provisions were identical.

Another bill I introduced is designed to prevent the pollution of waters in nearby regions. The passage of this legislation would make it unlawful to dump in the ocean chemicals and other materials harmful to fishing.

As a result of a bill introduced by me, President Eisenhower was authorized and gave to Irving Berlin in January 1955, a gold medal in recognition of his services in composing many patriotic songs, including God Bless America, which became popular during World War II. This was following a precedent created by a similar act in 1936, authorizing the presentation of a medal to George M. Cohan.

Among other legislation introduced by me and now pending before their respective committees are: An act calling for the erecting of a monument in honor of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid—through extensive research I have found that this famous naval hero is the actual designer of the American flag as it is today—he is buried in an unmarked grave in our own Green-Wood Cemetery in Brooklyn; an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, which would increase the penalty for transmitting false distress signals by radio—I am sure everyone recognizes the necessity for the tightening of the present law, because of the recent hoax.

An accomplishment of which I am very proud is one involving the religious designation placed by the armed services on members' "dog tags." Formerly, any religion other than "C." Catholic; "J." Jewish; and "P." Protestant, was designated by a mere "X." Members of the Eastern Orthodox faith felt that this made them second-class personnel in the Armed Forces, and asked my assistance in getting the Department of Defense to permit the addition of "E. O.", Eastern Orthodox, as authorized initials for the tags. Though I introduced a bill to provide for this, it was not necessary to be acted upon, for I was able to persuade the Secretary of the Army that this was a reasonable request. The necessary regulations have now been issued providing that all religious denominations have a letter designation on the "dog tags" of the armed services personnel.

During this past session also, I was pleased that the culmination of my 3 years of work in behalf of the tenants of Vanderveer housing which resulted in the recent replacement of the old board of directors by members of the Federal Housing Administration. It is hoped that this will eventually improve the

living conditions and lower the rents for the tenants of Vanderveer.

Although the 84th Congress was under the control of a Democrat majority, the Republicans have managed to get enacted much of the program requested by the President. The bulk of the administration's defense program was approved. So, too, was its housing program. We were able to defeat a Democrat-sponsored measure to restore the 90-percent-of-parity agriculture support bill. Its passage would have increased food prices to the consumers and in turn raised the cost of living.

The President's program for the distribution of the Salk vaccine to eligible children and expectant mothers was passed. Additional funds for the construction of schools were appropriated, for areas affected by Federal activities. Many measures for the benefit of veterans were enacted with bipartisan support. By this means also, we were able to obtain pay raises for Federal employees, postal employees, and an increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees.

It is pleasant at this point to note that the Republican administration has continued to wage the peace. This has been done by the initiation and persistence of a strong foreign policy based on firmness and strength.

On the domestic scene the Republican administration has helped to produce the greatest era of prosperity that the world has ever known. The transition from the war economy of the Korean conflict to a peacetime economy has taken place without sacrificing prosperity. Government wage, price, rent, and materials controls have come to an end. The cost of living has been stabilized.

In the preceding paragraphs I have tried to show you, the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York how I have personally tried to serve you. You are the people who elected me to represent you in the Congress of the United States. If there is any way in which I can be of service to you in my congressional capacity, please do not hesitate to call upon me. Both my Washington and Brooklyn offices remain open. I have a competent staff, and my services and theirs are yours. I want you to know that even when the Congress is not in session, I am on the job.

## Responsible and Constructive Opposition

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the record of this Congress has given America good government, and the prediction of a "cold war of partisanship" between Congress and the White House has failed to materialize. There is still much important work remaining for the next session—aid for highways and school construction are two big musts for 1956—but the accomplishments so far are im-

pressive. Below are listed my stand on key issues before this Congress:

Voted for extension of selective service and strengthening Reserves; stepped up production of jet bombers and fighter planes; special funds to prevent 22,000-man cut in Marine Corps; mutual-security program to strengthen free world defenses; resolution calling for United States aid to defense of Formosa; resolution opposing admission of Red China into U. N.; 3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements program; Government Reorganization Act of 1955; salary revisions for Federal employees, judges, and officials; code of fair practices for congressional committees; improvements in Federal employees' retirement system; aids to absentee voting for GI's and Government workers; railroad retirement system improvements; plugging loopholes in 1954 tax law; increase in minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1 per hour; increased penalties for violations of antimonopoly laws; continued renegotiation of Government contracts to eliminate excess profits; bill to provide United States currency with inscription "In God We Trust"; continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen; incentive pay increases and allowances for the Armed Forces; extension of VA direct-loan program; greater control over commodity speculation and manipulation; assistance to States for Salk polio-vaccine program; increased authority for FHA home mortgages; surplus Government material for schools and civil defense; increased penalties for narcotic violations; prohibition on use of mails to transport obscene literature; aid to States for airport construction; and life of Small Business Administration extension.

Voted against exemption of natural gas producers from regulations and the Chicago "water steal" from Lake Michigan.

Unfinished business: The Senate has still to pass legislation, which I voted for in the House, to broaden social security and to provide income tax reductions for low- and middle-income families. The urgently needed highway bill, for which I voted, needs action at the next session. So does other legislation which I favor, but which never reached the floor, such as a liberalized immigration law, aid for school construction, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, home rule for the District of Columbia, and a new veterans' hospital at Wood.

### 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests To Be Held in Adams County, Ohio

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES G. POLK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, August 1, 1955*

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the untiring efforts of a small group of farmers and business and professional men of Adams County, Ohio, the 1957

world's exposition and plowing contests will be held in Adams County, Ohio.

Mr. Earl K. DeVore, a prominent farmer and businessman of Winchester, Ohio, has been the leader in bringing this outstanding international event to Adams County, Ohio.

The officials of the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, Inc., are Mr. Earl K. DeVore, Winchester, Ohio, general chairman; Mr. Robert C. Miller, farm program director, Radio-TV Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, cochairman; Mr. Ellis Dorton, Peebles, Ohio, vice chairman; Mr. Carey W. Richey, Peebles, Ohio, secretary-treasurer; and Mr. Paul Wilson, Peebles, Ohio, assistant secretary-treasurer.

#### THE AIMS OF THE WORLD PLOWING ORGANIZATION

The purpose that inspires the World Plowing Organization is twofold and may be defined as the material and moral betterment of society as a whole. Unquestionably the fundamental problem that faces the world today is that of growing enough food for all, and anything and everything that tends to the betterment of agriculture adds to the betterment of mankind. The plow, now as always, is the basic instrument of food production and improved plowing methods mean more food. The World Plowing Organization believes that by stimulating world interest in the most ancient of all human crafts and by raising the standard and dignity of the plowman, the world contests organized by it will, by their influence, increase the fertility and yield of the soil of every continent.

Every entrant for the world championship contest has won his place as a result of a series of elimination contests in his own country—local, provincial, and national—in which hundreds of plowmen have taken part and every single one of these contests has aroused considerable local interest in the plowman's craft. When the competitors for the championship enter the field their progress is followed with interest by many thousands of enthusiasts from all over the world.

As regards the moral betterment for which the World Plowing Organization strives, this must necessarily be brought about by the friendly association in a common and basic endeavor of so many men and women from so many different countries. Better living and happiness for mankind are to be found in the discovery of the innumerable ties that unite us rather than in emphasizing the relatively few and, for the most part, artificial barriers that separate us. Men of good will of all nations cannot but find community of interest and understanding in the development and improvement of an art that is as old as history and as widespread as the human race itself.

The World Plowing Organization has a governing board which at the present time consists of John A. Carroll, honorary president, Canada; J. D. Thomas, president, chairman, Canada; J. J. Bergin, vice president, Ireland; G. T. Weir, treasurer, England; Vaino K. Neuvonen, Finland; Arie C. Stehouwer, Holland; Alf. Larsen, United States of America; Bengt Svensson, Sweden; Tore Wiig, Norway; Paul-Bildsoe Hansen, Den-

mark; Walter Feuerlein, Germany; Stanley G. Powell, Great Britain.

This organization has as its objectives:

First. To foster and preserve the art and improve the skill of plowing the land.

Second. To promote world championship contests.

Third. To provide facilities for demonstration work and trade displays.

Fourth. To urge the development and adoption of improved techniques and aids to man in all branches of agriculture.

Fifth. To foster a vigorous spirit of cooperation and enterprise in producing food for an increasing world population.

Sixth. By these means to encourage fellowship and understanding amongst the peoples of all nations.

Seventh. To support and cooperate with other bodies or associations in the furtherance of these objectives.

The first world event was held at Toronto, Canada, in 1953.

The schedule of other world events is as follows:

1954: Ireland.

1955: Sweden, University College Farm, Uppsala, October 8 and 9.

1956: England, Cambridge.

1957: United States, Peebles, Ohio, September 19 and 20.

1958: Germany.

The statement of Mr. J. D. Thomas, of Canada, president of the World Plowing Organization, follows:

This year over 1 million plowmen are getting ready to compete in organized plowing contests. Their ultimate goal is to be crowned the champion plowman of the world at the third annual world plowing matches to be held at Uppsala, Sweden, on October 8 and 9.

Mr. Thomas said that contestants will represent 13 countries which include Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Northern Ireland, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, and the United States; also observers will be present from Australia, Austria, India, and South America.

He added:

In order that as many people as possible from the United States and Canada may attend this year's matches in Sweden, Thomas Cook & Son, travel agency, has been appointed to handle all travel arrangements. The first world champion was J. Eccles of Canada; last year in Ireland, Hugh Barr of Northern Ireland was proclaimed world champion.

The world match is scheduled to be held in England at Cambridge in 1956, and at Peebles, Ohio, in the United States in 1957.

#### INVITATION OF YOUR HOSTS IN 1957

The statement of invitation from the farmers providing the land for the event follows:

Inviting the world to our humble community to participate in and to view the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, we, the citizens of Adams County, Ohio, offer you this statement of our belief.

We believe that the fathers and mothers of every nation in this world desire in their hearts world peace that their children might enjoy freedom from the hell of wars. Yet world peace is too great a price for them to pay if their children are to face starvation,



disease, and complete poverty. If war and conquering can offer any relief of these three destroyers of the desire to live, then parents are willing to use it and sacrifice peace in their day.

Wars are built upon starvation, disease, and poverty. The soil is the provider of the answer to these three wants. Ordinary citizens of America, people of the land, recognize the need for meeting the peoples of other lands on a common level, through the presentation of an event which fosters a frontal attack upon poverty, disease, and malnutrition. Here in America, Government is responsive to the will and the needs of the people. The governmental agencies of a Government springing directly from the people are tools designed and built for use by ordinary citizens. In preparing this gift of "get acquaintance" and of "know how" for the world, we will put to use as the tools they are these governmental servants. Extension specialists, soil conservationists, foresters, members of the United States State Department, and others are used just as a plow is used for the job for which it was designed—tilling the soil.

In America industry is of, by, and for the people; and thus it, too, knows that it must serve people to survive. Here in this great land the people have built industry by learning to till the soil properly. Agricultural advancements have destroyed hunger and the racking diseases of malnutrition, and they have released men's minds and bodies to build industries for the creation of higher standards of living.

Working the soils of the world will build the industries of the world. Working the soils of the world will build the peace fathers and mothers of every land so desperately want.

The fathers and mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers, of Adams County, Ohio, United States of America, offer this humble contribution of illustration (the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests) to the peoples of the world in our mutual struggle against poverty, disease, and malnutrition.

To assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, I have introduced a bill H. R. 7815 authorizing an appropriation of \$300,000, as follows:

A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in September 1957, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the sum of \$300,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, to remain available until expended, for the purpose of aiding in the defraying of certain expenses of the World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests of 1956, 1957, and 1958.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture may utilize the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in this act to make grants to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing necessary facilities for the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in 1957, including water lines for fire protection, sanitary facilities, temporary power and light systems, temporary sewage disposal units including necessary plumbing fixtures, and the construction of roads, and such other facilities as may be considered necessary by the Adams County Soil Conservation District.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reimburse the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, Inc., a nonprofit organization of Peebles, Ohio, and the Adams County Soil Conservation District for necessary expenses incurred by them prior to the date the appropriation authorized by this act is made.

Sec. 4. Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in this act which are not needed for the purposes of section 2 may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to defray the expenses of the United States participants in the 1956 world's championship plowing contests in England in 1956 and the 1958 world's championship plowing contests in Germany in 1958.

I shall request a hearing on H. R. 7815 when Congress reconvenes in January. The subject is very meritorious and I believe merits favorable consideration by the Congress.

### Philadelphia Scientists Have Been Pioneering in the Field of Space Satellites and in Urging Official Attention to the Significance of Satellite Experiments

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, the announcement on Friday, July 29, that the first artificial satellite project had been authorized was the herald of a new age—one which conjures up pictures of space travel, and interplanetary communication. We have every right in the world to feel proud of what our country is doing and to celebrate the fact that we live in a time when men have the courage and the vision to "set their hearts on the stars." Yet we should also remember that this new advance will bring new problems and new responsibilities.

Earlier this year, members of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society wrote to me to enlist my interest in this matter of artificial satellites, suggesting that the time had come for the United States seriously to consider work of this nature. Mr. Thomas Purdom, secretary of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society, asked my opinion on the subject and wanted to know if I thought work of this nature was practical. I replied that I thought it was a situation wherein the scientists should tell us what is involved and how practical or impractical it might be. I suggested that asking a Member of Congress whether the satellite projects were practical was a little like asking a Member in 1938 his views about the practical aspects of an atomic bomb.

#### THE LEVITT PROJECT: "MINNIE"

Subsequently, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Purdom a short description or outline of a satellite project proposed by Dr. I. M. Levitt, of the Franklin Institute at Philadelphia, one of a number of projects which had been capturing the interest of the scientific world. His project was given the nickname "Minnie." This is not the project finally decided upon by the Federal Government, but the work and thought which went into it are certainly worthy of note, and the members of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society have long felt that it is a very practical approach. I am includ-

ing the outline of the Levitt project—"Minnie"—at the end of these remarks under unanimous consent of the House, since I think it will be of great interest to all Members, and particularly in view of the announcement of last Friday at the White House.

As to the significance of the satellite project we are undertaking, the scientists who have devoted so much study to this problem believe it is most important for us to understand what is involved.

For, as they point out, within 24 hours after the announcement, a controversy was developing over whether or not to share the satellite's data with the entire world. This is not the place to offer any opinions on that controversy, because as the scientists tell us, there are good arguments on both sides, but it is the place to point out that such a controversy exists and that there will be other and greater controversies in the years to come, as we reach farther and farther into space.

#### THE MOST AWESOME INSTRUMENT OF POWER EVER DEvised

The secretary of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society, Mr. Purdom, wrote me that beyond this first unmanned satellite looms the first manned space station, an achievement which reputable scientists have said could be as close as 10 to 15 years away. When that station is established, barring unforeseen solutions to the tensions between nations, we will be faced with the problems of controlling the most awesome instrument of power ever devised by man.

The manned satellite, we are told, would be the ideal launching platform for guided missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads. Its owners would be able to destroy any spot on the earth they chose, any time they wanted to. Its construction would mean nothing less than military domination of the earth.

All of this means, according to our scientists, that we will one day in the future be faced with the same problems the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb have brought us—the problem of controlling the new and frightful and unbelievably destructive instruments of power which the scientists are placing in our hands. They say that as of last Friday, July 29, this new problem we face is no longer academic. We are living in the dawn of the interplanetary age, and the problems that age will raise, our scientists tell us, will demand the fullest capacities of our minds and hearts. The consideration of these problems is the job of statesmen everywhere and of all politically aware citizens.

Science has now again impressed us with the fact that we are living in a larger world in a different time than we had realized a few years ago or a few days ago. To the scientists must go the credit and the thanks for giving us the powers to expand our horizons. Few of us will be so timid as to want to turn back and to hide from the advances which science makes possible. But as the secretary of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society put it:

We must now reach within ourselves and find that courage and wisdom which will give us the right to say we are large enough men to live in this vastly enlarged world.

Mr. Speaker, on that sobering note, I include here as part of my remarks a fascinating outline of an imaginative pioneering effort in the field of space satellites, a discussion of the project "Minnie," proposed by Dr. I. M. Levitt, of the Franklin Institute, as follows:

#### THE LEVITT PROJECT: "MINNIE"

##### DESCRIPTION

Dr. Levitt's proposed satellite project, nicknamed "Minnie," consists of a four-stage liquid-fuel rocket. The bottom stage will be the improved version of the V-2 and the upper three stages will be smaller rockets of types which already exist. Stage four would contain a balloon covered with aluminum foil and weighing about 10 pounds. When the last stage had taken up orbit about 200 miles above the earth, the balloon would be released and inflated to a diameter of 15 feet by a small CO<sub>2</sub> cartridge. Then it would circle the earth like a new moon, balancing the centrifugal force caused by its terrific speed against the pull of earth's gravity.

##### COST OF THE PROJECT

"Minnie" will cost less than \$10 million. This is less than the cost of a B-52 bomber. It is also less than 1 percent of the entire 1953 guided missile program. And in many ways "Minnie" will be one of the most important single missiles in our entire development program. She will pay for herself in money saved.

##### SIGNIFICANCE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

"Minnie" will fit into the defense picture in several ways:

1. By using the moving satellite to triangulate the entire earth and parts of it, more accurate maps will be made at less expense (the ultimate savings will be several times the cost of the satellite). In this way the problems of accurately guiding missiles over intercontinental distances will be simplified and the accuracy of such missiles will be increased.

2. By similar techniques, the satellite will be used to determine the average value of the gravitational constant of the earth. This seemingly abstract value is of great use in the search for oil. Many field surveys into

fruitless areas could be eliminated and many untapped fields opened if we knew the value of this constant. Once again the money saved will be several times the cost of the project.

3. As a propaganda device. Visible as a bright new star every evening, racing across the sky in a few minutes, the satellite would be a symbol of our strength and a warning to aggressors of what we are capable of developing.

##### DETERMINING THE ORBIT

Calculating the satellite's exact orbit will be as easy (to the astronomers) as calculating the orbit of a new comet. The satellite will be photographed against a background of stars and these photographs will show us its position in terms of what the astronomer calls right ascension and declination. This information will uniquely determine the path of the satellite's orbit around the earth. The hard part of the job will be tracking the beacon—it will cross from horizon to horizon like a plane 3 miles up moving at 225 miles per hour—but modern instruments in use at White Sands can do the job with only a few modifications.

##### TRIANGULATING

Since the observer will know the satellite's position at any time, three observations will allow him to determine his own position. Surveying nowadays, particularly in flat, featureless lands, often calls for expensive installations and highly paid crews. The satellite would not only save us a good deal of money but would increase the accuracy of our measurements. The Atlantic Ocean, for instance, has been measured to within a thousand feet, using the moon and the same methods that would be used with the satellite. With "Minnie" lending a hand, the width of the Atlantic could be measured to within a hundred feet—which is particularly significant when firing guided missiles over intercontinental distances where an error of a thousand feet could mean much wasted time and money.

##### THE GRAVITATIONAL CONSTANT

With the aid of gravity meters, the modern geophysicist is able to explore the surface of the earth and map its gravitational field. Variations in this field are sometimes

due to light deposits of oil under a salt dome. If the explorer knew the precise value of the average gravitational constant for the earth, he would be able to determine whether these variations are truly significant. Field surveys into doubtful areas could be eliminated and a part of the \$5 million per year now spent on exploratory diggings in the United States could be saved. The effects of gravity on "Minnie's" orbit could be used to determine this important constant, which cannot be accurately measured by present methods.

##### SOME MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

What about meteors?

If the satellite is struck by a meteor, nothing of any importance will happen. The carbon dioxide will leak out but the satellite will not be deflated. In space there is no external pressure to force it out of the shape it has already attained.

What will "Minnie" lead to?

Though there are practical reasons for the project, and though it will pay for itself in a few years, "Minnie" is also important for the things to which she will lead. The knowledge of missile design gained will enable us to put instrumented rockets into space. These more complex satellites will not only have value to the military and to persons interested in weather forecasting, but will also give us information about conditions beyond the atmosphere. Such information, eventually, will lead to the establishment of a manned space station. And from there the future is wide open.

How much work is being done now?

We don't know, but there is as much reason to believe no project is underway as there is to believe one is. Despite the logical reasons for building an unmanned satellite, many rocket engineers seem to be hesitant about the idea, a reaction which is almost traditional when dealing with great technical developments. The position was best summed up by Dr. Levitt in his original paper on the satellite delivered before the International Astronautical Federation Congress at Innsbruck: "In time the [satellite] beacon could be a natural evolution of the guided-missile program but the time can be shortened if a directive is issued for the establishment of a beacon."

## SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1955

The Senate met, in executive session, at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

Eternal Spirit, Thou hast written Thy law in our hearts. In Thy fellowship alone we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks. In the brooding silence of this still moment, may open windows of faith flood our gloom with light that in Thy sunshine's blaze our day may brighter, fairer be.

We come with hearts grateful for freedom's glorious light. Dowered with privileges as no other nation, may the richness of our heritage be to us Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, to unshackle the enslaved, to clear the way for freedom, that through the potent ministry of our dear land all people of the earth may be blessed. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative

session, that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Monday, August 1, 1955, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BIBLE, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—HAROLD C. PATTERSON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Harold C. Patterson to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the unfinished business is the nomination of Mr. Harold C. Patterson to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I do not see present on the floor the Senator who desires to address the Senate this morning, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the pending question is on confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to succeed Mr. Paul R. Rowen, a member appointed by the last administration, whose term has expired.

Mr. President, I shall not confine my remarks to the nomination before us, because I believe the time has come to take a long and measured look at the emerging pattern of presidential nominations to the independent boards, commissions, and agencies created by Congress for the performance of functions delegated by Congress.

There is an odor arising in Washington, Mr. President; it is the odor of decay